

**DOCUMENT 1:**

**KENT & MEDWAY COUNCILS' RESPONSE  
TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC PANEL**



## Schedule 1: Summary of the Panel's Recommendations and the Councils' Response

Panel Rec. No.	Panel Report Chapter/Page	Kent and Medway Councils' Response
R2.1	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.2	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.3	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
<b>R2.4</b>	Chapter 2, page 2/8	<b>Not accepted</b>
R2.5	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.6	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.7	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.8	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.9	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R2.10	Chapter 2, page 2/8	Accepted
R3.1	Chapter 3, page 3/8	Accepted
R3.1a	Chapter 3, page 3/8	Accepted
R3.1b	Chapter 3, page 3/8	Accepted
R3.1c	Chapter 3, page 3/8	Accepted
R3.1d	Chapter 3, page 3/8	Accepted
R3.1e	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
R3.1f	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
R3.2	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
R3.3	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
R3.4	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
<b>R3.5</b>	Chapter 3, page 3/9	<b>Not accepted</b>
R3.6	Chapter 3, page 3/9	Accepted
R4.1	Chapter 4, page 4/9	Accepted
R4.2	Chapter 4, page 4/9	Accepted in part
R4.3	Chapter 4, page 4/12	Accepted
R4.4	Chapter 4, page 4/15	Accepted
R4.5	Chapter 4, page 4/16	Accepted
R5.1	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.2	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.3	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.4	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
<b>R5.5</b>	Chapter 5, page 5/3	<b>Accepted in part</b>
R5.6	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.7	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.8	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.9	Chapter 5, page 5/3	Accepted
R5.10	Chapter 5, page 5/9	Accepted
R5.11	Chapter 5, page 5/9	Accepted
R5.12	Chapter 5, page 5/9	Accepted
R5.13	Chapter 5, page 5/9	Accepted
<b>R5.14</b>	Chapter 5, page 5/9	<b>Not Accepted</b>
R5.15	Chapter 5, page 5/9	Accepted
R5.16	Chapter 5, page 5/13	Accepted
R5.17	Chapter 5, page 5/13	Accepted
R5.18	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.19	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.20	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.21	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.22	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.23	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.24	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted

Panel Rec. No.	Panel Report Chapter/Page	Kent and Medway Councils' Response
R5.25	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted in part
R5.26	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted in part
R5.27	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R5.28	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted in part
R5.29	Chapter 5, page 5/14	Accepted
R6.1	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.2	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.3	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.4	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted in part
R6.5	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.6	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.7	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted in part
R6.8	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted
R6.9	Chapter 6, page 6/5	Accepted in part
R6.10	Chapter 6, page 6/7	Accepted
R6.11	Chapter 6, page 6/7	Accepted in part
R6.12	Chapter 6, page 6/15	Accepted in part
R6.13	Chapter 6, page 6/15	Accepted in part
R6.14	Chapter 6, page 6/15	Accepted
R6.15	Chapter 6, page 6/15	Accepted
R7.1	Chapter7, page 7/6	Accepted
R7.2	Chapter7, page 7/6	Accepted
R7.3	Chapter7, page 7/6	Accepted
<b>R7.4</b>	Chapter7, page 7/6	<b>Not accepted</b>
R7.5	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.6	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.7	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.8	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.9	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.10	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted
R7.11	Chapter 7, page 7/10	Accepted in part
R7.12	Chapter 7, page 7/12	Accepted
R7.13	Chapter 7, page 7/12	Accepted
R7.14	Chapter 7, page 7/12	Accepted
R7.15	Chapter 7, page 7/12	Accepted
R7.16	Chapter 7, page 7/12	Accepted
R8.1	Chapter 8, page 8/5	Accepted
R8.2	Chapter 8, page 8/5	Accepted
R8.3	Chapter 8, page 8/5	Accepted
R8.4	Chapter 8, page 8/7	Accepted
R8.5	Chapter 8, page 8/14	Accepted
R8.6	Chapter 8, page 8/14	Accepted
<b>R8.7</b>	Chapter 8, page 8/14	<b>Not accepted</b>
R8.8	Chapter 8, page 8/14	Accepted in part
R8.9	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.10	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.11	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.12	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.13	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.14	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.15	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted

Panel Rec. No.	Panel Report Chapter/Page	Kent and Medway Councils' Response
R8.16	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
<b>R8.17</b>	Chapter 8, page 8/15	<b>Not accepted</b>
R8.18	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.19	Chapter 8, page 8/15	Accepted
R8.20	Chapter 8, page 8/16	Accepted
R9.1	Chapter 9, page 9/5	Accepted
<b>R9.2</b>	Chapter 9, page 9/5	<b>Not accepted</b>
R9.3	Chapter 9, page 9/6	Accepted
R9.4	Chapter 9, page 9/6	Accepted in part
R9.5	Chapter 9, page 9/11	Accepted
R9.6	Chapter 9, page 9/12	Accepted
R9.7	Chapter 9, page 9/14	Accepted
R9.8	Chapter 9, page 9/14	Accepted
R9.9	Chapter 9, page 9/14	Accepted
R9.10	Chapter 9, page 9/20	Accepted in part
R9.11	Chapter 9, page 9/20	Accepted
R9.12	Chapter 9, page 9/28	Accepted in part
R9.13	Chapter 9, page 9/28	Accepted
R9.14	Chapter 9, page 9/28	Accepted in part
<b>R9.15</b>	Chapter 9, page 9/32	<b>Not accepted</b>
R9.16	Chapter 9, page 9/34	Accepted in part
R9.17	Chapter 9, page 9/37	Accepted

Panel Rec. No.	Panel Report Chapter/Page	Kent and Medway Councils' Response
R9.18	Chapter 9, page 9/37	Accepted
R9.19	Chapter 9, page 9/42	Accepted
R9.20	Chapter 9, page 9/42	Accepted in part
R9.21	Chapter 9, page 9/42	Accepted
R9.22	Chapter 9, page 9/42	Accepted
R9.23	Chapter 9, page 9/42	Accepted in part
R9.24	Chapter 9, page 9/45	Accepted
R9.25	Chapter 9, page 9/45	Accepted
R9.26	Chapter 9, page 9/45	Accepted
R9.27	Chapter 9, page 9/45	Accepted
R9.28	Chapter 9, page 9/47	Accepted
R9.29	Chapter 9, page 9/52	Accepted
<b>R10.1</b>	Chapter 10, page 10/6	<b>Not accepted</b>
R10.2	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted
R10.3	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted
R10.4	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted
R10.5	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted in part
R10.6	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted
R10.7	Chapter 10, page 10/6	Accepted
R10.8	Chapter 10, page 10/7	Accepted
R10.9	Chapter 10, page 10/7	Accepted
R10.10	Chapter 10, page 10/7	Accepted

## Schedule 2: The Panel's Recommendations in Full and the Councils' Actions and Reasons

### Chapter 2 of Panel Report: Scope and Content

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R2.1	<p>Chapter 1 should be simplified in accordance with paragraph 2.6.</p> <p><i>[Para 2.6: Chapter 1 of the Plan concerns its Vision and Guiding Principles. This states that two Government growth areas are located in Kent and Medway and describes a distinct mosaic of urban and rural areas which, KCC/MC contend, helps to explain the background to the Plan's policies. However this section then goes into great detail with tables and diagrams on the South East Gross Domestic Product and on Traffic Flows, both of which would be more appropriate in later chapters as, by being so dominant, they detract from the basic message in this section. The following text reverts to the two Growth Areas of North Kent and Ashford, as well as the Priority Areas of Economic Regeneration and includes a second diagram on page 8 showing little more than that on page 4. For these reasons we consider that the first part of Chapter 1 lacks structure and provides excessive detail.]</i></p>	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R2.2	Appendix 1 should be differentiated from Tables IMP1 and IMP2 by use of colour.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R2.3	Policy QL5 on housing densities should be moved to the Chapter 7- Housing, and the policy on business densities moved to Chapter 6 - Fostering Prosperity.	Accepted.	<p>MOD 7.4 (Policy HP3a) MOD 6.8 (Policy FP1(g))</p> <p>Move QL5 to follow HP3 within Chapter 7. Wording of QL5 amended in accordance with PEC of June 2004 and with further revision proposed in response to representations on the PECs.</p> <p>Penultimate clause of QL5 to be amended and moved to Chapter 6 as a new clause at the end of Policy FP1.</p>
R2.4	Policies NR4, NR5 and NR6 should be moved to Chapter 5 – Promoting Quality of Life in Town and Country.	<p><b>Not accepted.</b></p> <p>These policies relate to pollution impacts and air quality and are considered to be wholly appropriate to the Natural Resources Chapter (Chapter 9).</p>	-
R2.5	The information contained the Area Based text in Chapter 7, paragraphs 7.12 to 7.24 should be incorporated in Chapter 3 – Area Based Policies.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R2.6	The Plan should be consistent in the definition and use of the terms North Kent, East Kent, Channel Corridor and West Kent.	Accepted.	<p>To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.</p> <p>See also: MOD 2.1 (Policies SS1/SS2) MOD 2.2 (Table SS1) MOD 6.3 (Policy FP1)</p>

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R2.7	The Plan should be consistent in the use of the terms "Kent" and "Kent and Medway".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan. This will make at the outset that references to 'Kent' throughout the Plan in the policies and Explanatory Memorandum refer to the whole of the structure plan area i.e. the administrative areas of Kent and Medway.
R2.8	<p>Add transport priorities to the Key Diagram in accordance with paragraph 2.34.</p> <p><i>[Para 2.34: PPG12 places emphasis on integrating transport and land use policies. However, whilst the Key Diagram indicates general locations such as the Growth Areas, strategic development locations and technology and knowledge clusters, it merely reflects the main road and rail routes. For instance there is no sense of priority in the Key Diagram to improving domestic passenger services to East Kent or for certain motorway junction improvements. We consider that further information regarding such matters should be included on the Key Diagram, sufficient to provide a complete picture of the overall Plan strategy.]</i></p>	Accepted.	MOD KD.10 (Key Diagram)
R2.9	The Plan should be consistent in its definition and use of the term "Strategic Development Locations", and the Key Diagram and its notation should accurately reflect the policies in the Plan in this connection.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan. See also: MOD KD.5 (Key Diagram) MOD KD.6 (Key Diagram) MOD 3.2 (Policy NK1) MOD 3.4 (Policy NK1) MOD 3.12 (Policy NK3) MOD 3.33 (Policy CC3)

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R2.10	KCC/MC should agree with SEERA and the district councils using a smaller number of key policies for monitoring, including rural policies, and should revisit the targets set out in Table IMP2.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum, including Table IMP2, prior to adoption of the Plan.

### **Chapter 3 of Panel Report: Spatial Strategy**

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R3.1	Policies SS1 and SS2 should be merged into a single policy which should:	Accepted.	MOD 2.1  Modification proposed to combine policies SS1 and SS2 into a single policy.
R3.1a	Include the key accessibility proposals from Chapter 8 of the Plan.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1  Revised Policy SS1 includes cross reference to transport and accessibility improvements identified in Chapter 8 of the Plan
R3.1b	State that the main priorities for investment, particularly public funding, are to facilitate development in the two Growth Areas of Thames Gateway and Ashford and in the PAER.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R3.1c	State that development should be concentrated in those areas presently listed under Policy SS2 but give some indication of scale between the areas. This might refer to the Area Based Policies as they provide good summaries of the development and infrastructure proposed.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1  Revised Policy SS1 includes cross reference to both the area-based policies (Chapter 3) and their reference to strategically significant development and the residential and employment land provisions in policies HP1 and FP1.
R3.1d	Omit the fourth paragraph of the current Policy SS2 regarding previously developed land as it features elsewhere and it confuses the issue because it contradicts other parts of the policy.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1
R3.1e	Add the need for timely public and private investment to the final paragraph of the current Policy SS2. It is agreed that the PEC of adding "retail" to this paragraph is appropriate.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1
R3.1f	Omit references to "re-balancing of housing pressure" (or "development" in the PEC) as it is not strictly true and the priority for housing development can be made clear under the first two bullet points above.	Accepted.	MOD 2.1
R3.2	Policy SS3 should generally confirm that priority accorded to PDL and paragraph (a) only be retained with paragraph 3 (sic) relating to the sequential approach deleted.	Accepted.	MOD 2.3  Note: Para 3.33 of Panel Report implies deletion of para (b) of SS3 while the recommendation refers to deletion of paragraph 3. Modification proposed to SS3 to delete paragraph SS3(b).

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R3.3	<p>Policy SS6 should be rewritten as follows:</p> <p>“a) Rural Service Centres, as identified on the Key Diagram, will be the focus for community services, improved public transport and small scale housing and employment serving the area;</p> <p>b) Smaller rural settlements may be identified in Local Development Documents as suitable for small scale development if they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- good road and public transport access and connectivity; and</li> <li>- an existing core of employment and community services.</li> </ul> <p>c) For larger rural settlements which lack services, a rural services standards assessment should be undertaken. The need for and provision for service improvements should be identified in community strategies and Local Development Documents.</p> <p>Other than at Strategic Development Locations identified by this Plan, development at, but outside the built confines of rural settlements, should be small scale and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identified in a Local Development Document; and</li> <li>- be supported by a special local justification which may include the provision of affordable housing, community facilities or the expansion of an established business.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Recommended wording to be adopted but in final clause “identified in a Local Development Document; and” to be replaced by “identified in a Local Development Document; or”.</p>	MOD 2.5 (Policy SS6)
R3.4	Delete Policy SS9 and add a paragraph to Policy SS8 stating that new building in the Green Belt should accord with the provisions of PPG2 and Annex B of PPG3 (see also Chapter 9 of this report).	Accepted.	MOD 2.8 (Policy SS8) MOD 2.9 (Policy SS8) MOD 10.2 (Policy WM2)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R3.5	Policy SP1 is not shown as a policy but is shown as the "Sustainable Development Objectives" of the Plan.	<p><b>Not accepted.</b></p> <p>The sustainable development objectives of the Plan are set out under the Key Themes and Principles in Chapter 1. The purpose of Policy SP1 (including the PEC of June 2004) is to reflect, within policy, the key criteria governing the approach of the Plan to economic, social and environmental well being and development. It sets the framework interpreting these criteria enabling subsequent policies to elaborate and clarify the principles of the Plan in relation to specific issues and sub-areas.</p> <p>This is a high-resolution policy which sets the tone for the approach of the Plan to environmental protection and enhancement and achieving a sustainable pattern and form of development. Its expression as policy is important to the Plan and it is therefore essential and appropriate that this policy is retained.</p>	
R3.6	Refer to small scale composting in the Green Belt under the text of Policy WM2.	Accepted	MOD 10.2 (Policy WM2)

## Chapter 4 of Panel Report: Overall Housing Provision

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R4.1	The Plan should not contain quantitative provision for housing post 2016, and that this should be deleted from Policy HP1. The note attached to Policy HP1 and the explanatory text should be modified to reflect the expectation of RPG coming forward with an increase in provision post 2016 (sic) for the region including Kent and Medway.	Accepted.  Policy HP1 modified to delete reference to provisions 2016-2021 and 2001-2021. With reference to the recommended changes to the footnote to HP1, the expectation of RPG9 is for an increase in housing provision regionally post-2006, not 2016 as stated by the Panel. The Structure Plan already provides for higher housing provision in Kent and Medway post-2006 in comparison with the period 2001-2006 and in relation to RPG9 guidance for Kent.	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)
R4.2	Policy HP1 should be further modified in consequence of the recommendations made in Chapter 9 of this report concerning area-based housing policies.	Accepted in part.  See relevant specific recommendations from Chapter 9 of Panel Report for each response.	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)
R4.3	Policy HP2, HP4, and HP5 should be combined into one single policy, incorporating the further amendment to HP2 (KMD 5:22, page 14), and the PEC to HP5.	Accepted.	MOD 7.2 (Policy HP2a)
R4.4	Policy HP3, the accompanying graph and related explanatory text, should be modified to provide an indicative County-wide target for PDL as defined in PPG3 Annex C. The explanatory text should state that the unitary/ district authorities should produce their own detailed urban capacity assessments in accordance with national guidance.	Accepted.	MOD 7.3 (Policy HP3)  District targets to be reflected in Explanatory Memorandum rather than policy, but targets need to be looked at in light of PPG3 Annex C and proposed modifications to district housing provisions

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R4.5	Policy HP8 should be amended in accordance with the PEC.	Accepted.	MOD 7.9 (Policy HP8)

### **Chapter 5 of Panel Report: Fostering Prosperity**

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R5.1	Throughout the Plan, consistent units of either land area in hectares or floorspace in square metres should be used to quantify employment provision, and the ratio of 3,500sqm floorspace per hectare should be explained in the explanatory text.	Accepted.	MOD 3.17 (Policy EK1) MOD 3.33 (Policy CC3) MOD 6.2 (Policy FP1(b))  Recommendation also to be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.2	The title of Chapter 6 should be modified to "Employment and Prosperity".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.3	The first subheading of Chapter 6 should be modified to: "THE ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.4	Policy FP1(b), last item, should be modified by deleting "up to 40 hectares" and inserting after "provided", "where required to".	Accepted.	MOD 6.2 (Policy FP1(b))

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R5.5	Policy FP1(b), second item, should be modified by adding after "Canterbury", "and additional land for office accommodation and business according to local need".	Accepted in part.  Reference to land provision for office accommodation included but it is considered that reference to Use Classes B1a and B1b will provide consistency with the changes recommended by the Panel for the area policy for Canterbury (EK1). An indication of the scale of land provision should also be incorporated. Strategic policy guidance on the scale and location of land for employment and business development is considered appropriate given the guidance within PPG12 and provides a necessary framework for local plan/LDD preparation.	MOD 6.2 (Policy FP1(b))
R5.6	Policy FP1(d) should be deleted and the management of employment land supply should be explained in the supporting text.	Accepted.	MOD 6.4 (Policy FP1(d))  To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.7	Policy FP1(e), (f), (g) and notes should be renumbered as appropriate and modified in accordance with the PECs.	Accepted.	MOD 6.5 (Policy FP1(e)) MOD 6.6 (Policy FP1(f)) MOD 6.7 (Policy FP1(g))
R5.8	Policy FP3 should be modified by deleting reference to Link Park, Lympne. (See also Chapter 9 of the Panel report).	Accepted.	MOD 6.11 (Policy FP3)
R5.9	Policy FP0 should be added to Chapter 6 in accordance with the further amendments.	Accepted.	MOD 6.1 (New Policy FP0)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R5.10	The explanatory text to Policy FP4 should contain reference to the selection criteria used in the identification of TKCs [Technology and Knowledge Clusters]; interaction of the education and business sectors, and the importance of aviation technology and training.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.11	The explanatory text and Policy FP4 should make clear that reference to Rochester Airfield relates to adjacent built development and not to the airfield itself.	Accepted.	MOD 6.12 (Policy FP4) Also MOD 6.11 (Policy FP3) Also to be clarified by way of reference in the Explanatory Memorandum.
R5.12	Policy FP4 should be modified in accordance with the PECs.	Accepted.	MOD 6.12 (Policy FP4)
R5.13	Policy FP4 should be modified by deleting the word "exceptional" from the preamble.	Accepted.	MOD 6.12 (Policy FP4)
R5.14	Policy FP4 should be modified by deleting "Horticultural Research Institute (HRI): East Malling".	<p><b>Not Accepted.</b></p> <p>Whilst the strategic significance of the FP4 locations stems, in part, from the scope for growth it also relates to the intrinsic significance and calibre of the activity that they support. East Malling is acknowledged as a research institute of international repute. Proposals for growth and change here and at the other FP4 locations would be subject to both the environmental and accessibility criteria within Policy FP4 and other policies of the Plan. In these circumstances the recommended deletion of East Malling from Policy FP4 is not supported.</p>	-

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R5.15	KCC/MC should re-consider whether the Plan should include provision for enhanced higher education in Kent.	Accepted.  The Councils do not consider that circumstances have materially changed since the EIP to warrant any change to policy on this matter. The Plan gives specific support to expansion of further and higher education at Medway (QL13/NK2) and Canterbury (QL13/EK1) and Ashford (QL13).	-
R5.16	The title above paragraph 6.42 should be modified to "ENSURING THE PROSPERITY OF REGIONAL, TOWN AND OTHER CENTRES".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.17	Table FP4 should be modified as follows:  Title: Strategic Hierarchy of Regional, Town and Other Centres  Delete "DISTRICT CENTRES: (1) URBAN ..... OTHER TOWN CENTRES and substitute "URBAN SERVICE CENTRES"  Delete "DISTRICT CENTRES: (2)", leaving only "RURAL SERVICE CENTRES"  Modify the last line to "District and Local Centres to be defined in LDDs"	Accepted.	MOD 6.27 (Table FP4)
R5.18	Policy FP13 should be modified to refer to Table FP4.	Accepted.	MOD 6.28 (Policy FP13)
R5.19	Paragraphs 6.42 to 6.54, the map at page 85 should be modified consistent with Table FP4 and Policy FP13 to include explanations of all terms used, and all such terms should appear in the Glossary.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R5.20	Policy FP14 should be modified in accordance with the PECs and Document KMD5:22 and in addition should refer to Table FP4, as well as to the Key Diagram.	Accepted.	MOD 6.29 (Policy FP14)
R5.21	Policy FP15 criterion (a) should be deleted.	Accepted.	MOD 6.32 (Policy FP15(a))
R5.22	Policy 15 Criterion (b) should be modified in accordance with the PECs.	Accepted.	MOD 6.33 (Policy FP15(b))
R5.23	Policy 15 criterion (c) (sic) should be modified to avoid reference to mixed development or be placed elsewhere in the Plan.  <i>[Note: Recommendation refers to criterion (c) but relevant criterion is (e).]</i>	Accepted.	MOD 6.36 (Policy FP15(c))
R5.24	Policy FP16 should be deleted.	Accepted.	MOD 6.37 (Policy FP16) MOD 6.30 (Policy FP14)  Part of clause (a) of FP16 is proposed for incorporation as part of FP14.
R5.25	Policy FP17 should be deleted.	Accepted in part.  Policy FP17 provides a benchmark for consideration through Local Development Documents of quantitative and/or the qualitative need for large food store provision including that associated with the strategic scale developments identified by the Structure Plan. Revised wording of the policy nests its provisions within the sequential approach established under Policy FP14.	MOD 6.38 & 6.39 (Policy FP17)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R5.26	The supporting text to Policies FP16 and FP17 should be modified to exclude reference in paragraph 6.65 to retail spending predictions and other wise to comply with other text and policy changes.	Accepted in part.  To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan. Reference to expenditure projections will be qualified to reflect their 'snapshot' character and the need for regular review both overall and in relation to specific proposals.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.27	The heading above paragraph 6.66 should be modified to "Urban and Rural Service Centres".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R5.28	Policy FP18 should be modified to:  Title: Urban and Rural Service Centres  An appropriate scale of retail and service provision will be supported in the USCs [Urban Service Centres] and RSCs [Rural Service Centres] identified in Table FP4 and on the Key Diagram where it will underpin their role, viability and vitality.	Accepted in part.  Revised wording recommended by the Panel has been incorporated in FP18 but with recognition that retail and service development at other centres (district and local centres) may be appropriate and should be led through assessment and provision in Local Development Documents.	MOD 6.40 (Policy FP18)
R5.29	The explanatory text should be modified to make clear that the strategic co-ordination of town centre retail and leisure development and the housing and business initiatives of North Kent Thameside Growth area should be considered in future Plan review and RSS preparation.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

## Chapter 6 of Panel Report: Accessibility

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R6.1	<p>The first part of Chapter 8, before the heading "Major Transport Improvements", should be redrafted in accordance with paragraphs 6.13- 6.15 above to take into account the Regional Transport Strategy, RPG9 Chapter 9 of July 2004, in such a way as to indicate an explicit spatial link between land use and transport infrastructure priorities. This section should highlight the importance of the CTRL and include a new Policy to establish the fundamental aim of "Transport Integration"</p> <p><i>[Para 6.13: However, we agree with the criticism by SEERA and GOSE that the Plan fails to provide a spatial matrix of development served by the transportation network in all its modes. Rather, the Plan simply lists the transportation infrastructure that requires external funding to support its land-use aims. This is a subtle switch of emphasis, and we accept that this is hard to achieve, especially in a Plan that was first drafted pursuant to earlier guidance. However, we consider that the Plan should express a clearer spatial link between land-use and infrastructure priorities that is currently only implicit. We think any shortcoming in this respect results not from any significant error or omission in the Plan, but rather from its fragmented structure. We make general comment on this aspect of the presentation of the Plan in early chapters of this report.</i></p> <p><i>Para 6.14: Nevertheless, it became clear through our discussions at the EiP that the early part of the "Accessibility" chapter needs restructuring to emphasise from the outset that its basis lies in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RTS) published since the Plan was drafted as a revision to Chapter 9 of RPG9. To accord with the latter guidance, Chapter 8 should begin with a sharp definition of the need for accessibility in the County to be enhanced, the amount of travel, particularly by road and especially private car, to be reduced, and for transportation schemes to be spatially integrated with other aspects of development.</i></p>	Accepted.	<p>MOD 8.1 (New Policy TP0)</p> <p>Other changes to be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.</p>

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
	<i>Para 6.15: In contrast with our recommended approach, the Revised Deposit Plan begins with some bland statements of fact devoid of any sub heading to indicate their purpose, and includes boxed lists of issues and aims that are unfocussed and repetitious. The crucial aim of integration deserves policy status and a new policy should be inserted to set the scene for the Chapter.]</i>		
R6.2	Chapter 8 should be modified to refer to detailed national and regional transport programming and funding priorities, including scheme ranking, sub divided according to funding source. Additional SPG should include tabulated information that can be regularly updated, relating transportation schemes to Plan policies.	Accepted.	MOD 8.3 (Policy TP3 & Table TP3) MOD 8.4 (Policy TP4 & Table TP4) MOD 8.5 (Policy TP5 & Table TP5) MOD 8.7 (Policy TP7 & Table TP7)
R6.3	Policy TP1 should be modified by the addition of a criterion related to the consideration of "existing local road congestion" and the term "major" should be deleted from the preamble and from the heading to the supporting text.	Accepted.	MOD 8.2 (Policy TP1)
R6.4	Policy TP7 should be modified by adding to the first sentence: "or such other schemes as shall from time to time be identified in LDDs as necessary to the implementation of the strategic objectives of this Structure Plan".	Accept in part.  Strategically significant transport schemes necessary to the implementation of the Structure Plan should be identified by it and through Local Transport Plans. However there may be circumstances e.g. locations of major growth and change in the regional growth areas where masterplanning for the planned scale of change provides for development and refinement of schemes of this nature. This can be recognised in the Explanatory Memorandum supporting Policy TP7.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R6.5	Policies TP1 to TP7 should be modified in accordance with the proposed PECs.	Accept.	MOD 8.2 (Policy TP1) MOD 8.3 (Policy TP3 & Table TP3) MOD 8.4 (Policy TP4 & Table TP4) MOD 8.5 (Policy TP5 & Table TP5) MOD 8.6 (Policy TP6) MOD 8.7 (Policy TP7 & Table TP7)  Some further amendments proposed in addition to the PECs to reflect current circumstances.
R6.6	Policy TP11 should be modified to distinguish motorways, trunk roads and other primary routes according to the priority given to access provision in national guidance and to require provision of necessary access, construction or improvements in advance of development.	Accept.	MOD 8.10 (Policy TP11)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R6.7	Policies TP16 and TP17 should be combined into a single policy allowing goods vehicles to use roads when access is justified along them, providing standards of safety and amenity can be safeguarded, including by acceptable highway improvements.	Accepted in part.  R6.7 accepted for a combined policy, but in all other respects not accepted. The tenor of the policy phrasing advocated by the Panel is not considered appropriate to the circumstances of Kent's traffic and web of minor roads. These policies recognise the importance of safety considerations but were also framed in recognition of the impact that improvements to minor roads can have on the attraction of non essential traffic, safety conditions for non vehicular users and on landscape and conservation interests. In these respects it is felt that the stance of these policies should remain unaltered.	MOD 8.12 (Policy TP16/TP17)
R6.8	Policy TP18 should be modified in accordance with the revised suggested wording to include the test of need in relation to other planning and environmental considerations [KMD 5:22].	Accepted.	MOD 8.13 (Policy TP18)
R6.9	Policy TP19 should be modified to refer to the application of maximum parking standards to be determined according to local circumstances and its explanatory text should be modified to explain the purpose and principle of maximum parking standards in terms of PPG13 and the RTS of RPG9.	Accepted in part  The current standards to which TP19 refers are contained within supplementary planning guidance and are maximum standards. TP19 should be explicit as to their nature. The scope for adopting local variation i.e. more stringent standards where expressed and tested through local plan/LDD preparation is recognised and in accordance with established practice. Such variations should be brought forward with the agreement of the relevant local transport authority.	MOD 8.14 (Policy TP19)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R6.10	Policy TP23 should be modified by deleting the penultimate bullet point and substituting "evidence is provided that the proposal is necessary and viable and will not have any significant adverse impact on the local highway network".	Accepted.	MOD 8.16 (Policy TP23)
R6.11	Policy TP23 should be modified to include development and environmental criteria, including reference to improved access facilities to serve the identified locations.	Accept in part.  Reference to the development and environmental criteria recommended are incorporated in the proposed modification. TP23 already makes reference to necessary access improvements required to serve the development locations identified.	MOD 8.16 (Policy TP23)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R6.12	<p>Policies TP24 and TP25 should be combined to form a single policy as follows:</p> <p>“Kent International (Manston) Airport and London Ashford (Lydd) Airport”</p> <p>The development of Manston Airport into a regional airport with a capacity of up to 6 million passengers per annum by 2021 and Lydd Airport with a capacity of up to 2 million passengers by 2011 will be supported. Proposals for the developments of the airports will be assessed for acceptability against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development being directly related to the operation of the airports unless otherwise forming part of a proposal in a Local Development Document; and</li> <li>- no significant detrimental impact on internationally, nationally or locally designated environmental areas</li> <li>- no significant detrimental impact on the amenities of local communities which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and</li> <li>- appropriate measures being secured to mitigate the impact of development including noise control, air pollution, light pollution, water pollution, sewerage disposal, landscape and habitat management; and</li> <li>- the requirements for surface access being adequately accommodated within the capacity of the existing or committed local transport network; and</li> <li>- measures being identified and secured to improve access by public transport modes including the provision of direct rail links. In the case of Manston a direct rail link should be secured and implemented when the capacity of the airport reaches 3 million passengers per annum.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted in part.</p> <p>Two separate policies retained. This recognises that the development and environmental considerations at the airports differ in scale and degree. Separate policies will include common assessment criteria for development proposals at each location.</p> <p>Support in principle for expansion of aviation at Lydd is retained but reference to specific capacity of 'up to 2 million passengers' is not included at this juncture pending fuller understanding of the nature and degree of impacts associated with airport expansion in this location.</p> <p>Separate criteria to be provided relating respectively to impacts on internationally/ nationally and locally designated environmental areas.</p>	<p>MOD 8.17 (Policy TP24) MOD 8.18 (Policy TP25)</p>

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R6.13	<p>Policy TP26 should be modified to delete the words "wider community" to "regional economies" to accord with Annex B of PPG13; re-numbered as appropriate; and the following wording included in respect of Rochester Airport:</p> <p>"Proposals for the development of new facilities for commercial and recreational aviation at Rochester Airport will be permitted provided they have a positive impact on the local and regional economies and not an adverse impact on the local and wider community. The airport is to be safeguarded against development that could prejudice its operation."</p>	<p>Accept in part.</p> <p>Whilst the Panel's recommendations should be accommodated, it is considered that Policy TP26 should continue to refer to community impacts alongside impacts on the local and wider economy. The recommendation in respect of Rochester Airport is also accepted in part, with some variation from the wording proposed by the Panel to maintain compatibility with the wider change proposed for the first part of Policy TP26.</p>	MOD 8.19 (Policy TP26)
R6.14	Policy TP23: Add "subject to Policy TP24" to the sixth bullet point relating to Manston in the first paragraph.	Accepted.	MOD 8.16 (Policy TP23)
R6.15	Policy NR4: Add "noise" to the first paragraph of the policy.	Accepted.	MOD 9.3 (Policy NR4)

## **Chapter 7 of Panel Report: Environment**

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R7.1	Policy SS10 and its explanatory text should be placed after Policies SS1 and SS2 and renumbered as appropriate.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R7.2	An additional paragraph should be added at the beginning of the explanatory text to Policy SS10 to read: "In view of the pressure for new development resulting from the Growth Areas of the Thames Gateway and Ashford, it is important to keep separate the major urban areas of Maidstone, the Medway Gap, the Medway Towns and Sittingbourne by designating Strategic Gaps. This designation is to be reviewed periodically, in Regional and Sub Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, according to the progress and impact of development in the Growth Areas and elsewhere. The overall character and identity of individual settlements throughout Kent is separately protected by the provisions of Policy QL4."	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.3	The remaining content of paragraphs 2.31 and 2.32 defining the extent and role of the Strategic Gaps should be combined.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.4	Policy SS10 should be modified only in the second paragraph, by deleting "limits" and substituting "built confines", and by adding "Local Plans/" before "Local Development Documents".	<p><b>Not accepted.</b></p> <p>Modification to second paragraph of the policy takes forward a PEC and is agreed. However the PEC to the first paragraph of SS10 is also retained.</p> <p>Para 7.28 of the Panel Report maintains that the PEC adding reference to the role of the Strategic Gap in separating Iwade from Sittingbourne and Ridham/Kemsley is not necessary although agreeing that this small corridor of openness should receive the protection of Strategic Gap designation'. The PEC is felt by the Councils to be important in giving policy recognition to the strategic separating function of the Gap in this area and is retained.</p>	MOD 2.11 (Policy SS10) MOD 2.12 (Policy SS10)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R7.5	The Policies E1 to E5 and paragraphs 4.1 to 4.15 inclusive should be modified as necessary to maintain consistent application of the terms "protect", "conserve" and "enhance" with respect to environmental interests.	Accepted.	MOD 4.1 (Policy E1) MOD 4.2 (Policy E2) MOD 4.3 (Policy E3) MOD 4.4 (Policy E4) MOD 4.6 (Policy E5)  Also to be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.6	Title before paragraph 4.7 should be modified to: "Countryside Character".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.7	Paragraph 4.10 should be modified to refer to the role of LDDs in developing criteria-based landscape assessment.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.8	The title of Policy E3 should be modified to: "Protection and Enhancement of Countryside Character".	Accepted.	MOD 4.3 (Policy E3)
R7.9	Paragraph 4.14 should be modified to indicate that the designation of SLAs will be reviewed in the process of preparing Regional and Sub Regional Spatial Strategies.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.10	The final paragraph of Policy E5 should be modified to: "The primary objective of designating Special Landscape Areas is the protection, conservation and enhancement of their landscapes, whilst having regard to the need to facilitate the social and economic well-being of the communities situated within them."	Accepted.	MOD 4.6 (Policy E5)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R7.11	The first paragraph of Policy E3 should be modified by the addition of the following sentence: "Where locally significant landscapes are formally assessed, they may be identified in LDDs".	Accept in part.  The thrust of this modification is accepted through additional policy wording at the end of the policy. This clarifies that the local significance of landscapes stemming from both their character and quality should be derived from formal assessments and recognised through designation in Local Development Documents.	MOD 4.3 (Policy E3)
R7.12	A further sentence should be added to the end of paragraph 4.26 to read: "In this connection, the potential value to biodiversity of previously developed land and previously worked sites should be taken into account."	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R7.13	The title of Policy E8 should be modified to "Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity".	Accepted.	MOD 4.7 (Policy E8)
R7.14	The first sentence of Policy E8 should be modified to read: "Wildlife habitats and species will be protected, conserved and enhanced, especially .....".	Accepted.	MOD 4.8 (Policy E8)
R7.15	The first sentence of Policy E12 should be modified by inserting "and river catchments" after "corridors".	Accepted.	MOD 4.13 (Policy E12)
R7.16	Policies E8, E9, E11, E12 and E13 should also be modified in accordance with the published PECs.	Accepted.	MOD 4.9 (Policy E8) MOD 4.10 (Policy E9) MOD 4.11 and 4.12 (Policy E11) MOD 4.13 (Policy E12) MOD 4.14 (Policy E13)

## Chapter 8 of Panel Report: Managing Natural Resources

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R8.1	The first sentence of Policy NR8 should read "The development of new or expansion of water supply or wastewater facilities will be required and supported where..."	Accepted.	MOD 9.5 (Policy NR8)
R8.2	The three final sentences of Paragraph 9.29 should be deleted and replaced by: "Beyond this there will be a need to develop new resources. This will include the need for new water supply facilities in East Kent to meet demand from new development, particularly Ashford, and to facilitate reductions in abstraction levels in the River Stour. This new supply may be by building of a new strategic scale reservoir at Broadoak near Canterbury but further studies are required to ascertain the correct scale and type of facility as well as the timing of this requirement. Additionally, transfers of water from areas with a surplus, efficient reuse and desalination will need to be explored. All options will have Environmental impacts and significant costs."	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.3	The new NR Policy, as suggested in the PEC should be added to the Plan with an appropriate text. This should also incorporate the text of Policy QL1 (iii) (e), and policy QL1 (iii) (e) should now read "incorporate sustainable construction techniques as detailed in NR Policy (to be numbered)".	Accepted.	MOD 5.3 (Policy QL1) MOD 9.1 (New Policy NR0)  Also to be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.4	Policy NR9 should be modified in accordance with the PEC.	Accepted.	MOD 9.6 (Policy NR9)
R8.5	The Plan should make consistent use throughout of the terms "greenhouse gases" and "carbon dioxide – CO2".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R8.6	A new NR policy should be included in accordance with the PEC, but paragraph (b) should be modified to refer to greenhouse gases rather than CO2 emissions.	Accepted.	MOD 9.1 (New Policy NR0)
R8.7	The section of Chapter 9 headed "A Clean Environment" should be relocated in Chapter 5.	<b>Not accepted.</b>  This section and associated policies relate to pollution impacts and air quality and are considered to be wholly appropriate to the Natural Resources Chapter (Chapter 9).	-
R8.8	The title of Chapter 9 should be modified to "Natural Resources" and subtitled: "Climate Change - Energy Production - Water Resources - Flood Risk".	Accepted in part.  Accepted with addition of 'Pollution and Air Quality' in sub title to reflect retention of these policies in this chapter.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.9	The remainder of Chapter 9 should be substantially edited in the manner described in the foregoing paragraphs to include the following structural modifications and to incorporate the detailed modifications recommended below together with any further consequential modifications.	Accepted.	-
R8.10	Chapter 9 should be set out under the main headings of "Key Issues" (paragraphs 9.1-2 and 9.13-15), "Climate Change" (paragraph 9.3 and text boxes), "Energy Production" (paragraphs 9.4-6), "Water Resources" and "Flood Risk".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.11	The section entitled "Energy Production" should be set out under second order headings of "Power Generation", to include paragraphs 9.4-6, "Renewable Energy", to include paragraphs 9.7 and its text boxes, 9.8, 9.10 and the table at page 141 and "Sustainable Energy", to include paragraphs 9.11-12".	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R8.12	Under the third order heading "Solar Power", the text should refer to the importance of domestic scale solar water heating.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.13	Under the third order heading "Bio Fuels" the text should refer to industrial and commercial sources and the European target for the use of bio fuels for road transport.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.14	A new third order heading "Small-Scale and Community Renewable Energy Proposals" should be inserted after the sub sections on specific sources, with text highlighting the importance of small-scale and community renewable energy proposals, including in rural locations.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.15	A new third order heading "Production Targets for Renewable Energy" should be inserted after the new sub section on small-scale schemes and above the text of paragraph 9.8, modified to refer to "indicative targets" and drawing attention to the table at page 141.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.16	The table at page 141 should be numbered consistent with other tables of the Plan, re-titled "Indicative Targets for Renewable and Sustainable Energy" and modified if necessary to include targets set down in the final version of the changes to RPG9; these targets should be qualified as "provisional" if the changes to RPG9 have not been finalised.	Accepted.  (RPG/RSS sub regional targets have now been finalised.)	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.17	Paragraph 9.9 and the table at page 142 should be deleted.	<b>Not accepted.</b>  This research data supports the RPG9 Alterations on Energy Efficiency and should be retained but with appropriate reference to its source and status.	

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R8.18	Under the third order heading "Combined Heat and Power", the text should refer to the Government Strategy for CHAPTER to 2010 and should encourage the role of mini- and micro-CHAPTER installations as an integral part of new development.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.19	A new third order heading "Landfill Gas" should be inserted above the last part of paragraph 9.11 dealing with landfill gas, which should be expanded to include background and indicative target information consistent with RPG9; such targets to be qualified as "provisional" if the changes to RPG9 have not been finalised.	Accepted.  RPG/RSS targets have now been finalised.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R8.20	<p>The title of Policy NR2 should be modified to "Renewable and Sustainable Energy Production" and the Policy modified to:</p> <p>Development necessary for the production of energy from renewable sources will be supported where there would be no overriding conflict with environmental interests and Local Development Documents will include criteria for their location. Provision of renewable and sustainable energy production as an integral component of new development and in small-scale and community projects will be supported. Local Development Documents will include renewable energy production targets in support of Sub Regional targets for individual energy sources, and will identify sites for renewable and sustainable energy facilities where viable proposals have been put forward.</p>	Accepted.	MOD 9.2 (Policy NR2)

## Chapter 9 of Panel Report: Area Based Policies

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
	<b><i>Dartford and Gravesham</i></b>		
R9.1	The second bullet point of paragraph 2.27 of the Plan should be modified to read "Near London, containing the outward growth of Dartford and Swanley...."	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R9.2	Policy SS8 should be modified to delete the second paragraph relating to Eastern Quarry. (See also Chapter 3 of our report).	<b>Not accepted.</b>  The exclusion of Eastern Quarry from the Green Belt was determined through the 1996 Kent Structure Plan but new boundaries have yet to be determined through an adopted local plan/local development document. Pending this, retention of the reference to revision of the Green Belt in this area is appropriate.	
R9.3	Policy NK1 should be modified by adding reference to flood defences, water resources and wastewater treatment in its first paragraph.	Accepted.	MOD 3.1 (Policy NK1)
R9.4	The footnote to Policy HP3 should be modified to give a percentage total for former mineral working sites and other damaged land in Kent.	Accepted in part.  Panel Recommendation R4.4 advises that the target for the use of previously developed land in HP3 should be re-based to correspond with the PPG3 Annex C definition and exclude other former mineral working sites. Reference will be made in the Explanatory Memorandum to the role of such land in the strategy especially within Kent Thameside.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
	<b>Medway</b>		
R9.5	The final sentence of paragraph 3.12 of the Plan should be modified to allow Chattenden/Lodge Hill to come forward when the Ministry of Defence has vacated its holdings.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R9.6	Policy NK2 should be modified to add the following: "As part of a comprehensive greenspace strategy, provision will be made for a network of open land ('Green Grid') which will link major areas of open space with the Thames and Medway and with existing communities".	Accepted.	MOD 3.11 (Policy NK2)
R9.7	Paragraph 3.14 should be modified to make clear that development at Rochester Airfield relates to the surrounding commercial area and not to the airfield itself.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.  See also MOD 3.10 (Policy NK2)
R9.8	Policy NK2 should be modified by adding to the second paragraph: "on previously developed land or such alternative land as may be identified in DPDs in the event that the former defence land fails to come forward when necessary to provide for the planned employment or housing provision for Medway."	Accepted.	MOD 3.9 (Policy NK2)
R9.9	Paragraph 3.12 should be modified to make clear that priority will be given to the development of previously developed land within the boundary of the defence site at Chattenden-Lodge Hill and that alternative land may be identified if the defence land fails to come forward when necessary to provide for the planned employment or housing provision for Medway.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R9.10	<p><b>Swale</b></p> <p>Policy HP1 should be modified by the addition of 2,200 additional dwellings to the housing provision for Swale Borough.</p>	<p>Accepted in part.</p> <p>Modification 7.1 adds 800 dwellings to the HP1 provision for Swale 2001-2016. This takes account of the evidence put to the EIP that the headroom between current strategic policy and potential capacity as identified through recent local plan work includes a substantial element unlikely to be delivered pre 2016. The latter includes part of the two additional strategic development locations for Sittingbourne included in the PEC to Policy NK3. The Panel did not propose the identification within the Structure Plan of further strategic development locations to augment housing supply during the Structure Plan period. Structure Plan policy towards Swale remains predicated on more restraint in comparison with the previous Structure Plan to reduce reliance on valued greenfield land to meet development requirements. This is felt to be fully in accordance with the emphasis of Thames Gateway strategy on regeneration and re-use of land.</p>	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)
R9.11	Policy NK3 should be modified in accordance with the PEC.	Accepted.	MOD 3.14 & 15 & 16 (Policy NK3 – (e), (f) and (g))

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
	<b>Ashford</b>		
R9.12	Policy CC1 and the text should be modified to refer to areas of search in terms of RPG9, without reference to greenfield land.	Accepted in part.  Reference to areas of search at Ashford is modified to reflect the diagrammatic illustration of this in the RPG9 Alterations for the Ashford Growth Area. However the conditional reference to greenfield land requirements is retained. Whilst it is fully acknowledged that the scale of planned development at Ashford will require additional greenfield land this does not obviate the application of the sequential approach in ensuring that planned requirements are fully met.	MOD 3.26 (Policy CC1)
R9.13	Policy CC1 should be modified by deleting from the third paragraph "up to 40 hectares of" and adding after "2011", "for balanced employment and housing growth".	Accepted.	MOD 3.27 (Policy CC1)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R9.14	<p>The supporting text and Policy CC1 itself should contain clear explanation of the Growth Area status of Ashford in terms of the RPG9 Alterations 2004, including that such growth is to be complementary to that of neighbouring Districts.</p>	<p>Accepted in part.</p> <p>This recommendation to be fully reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum. It is noted that the reference to growth at Ashford that is complementary to its neighbours is referred to in RPG9 Chapter 12 (Ashford Growth Area) para 12.64 but is not defined or accorded policy status. In the light of this reference to complementary growth in CC1 is not considered appropriate without clarification of its basis and means of implementation. CC1 clearly identifies Ashford as a regional centre for growth.</p> <p>And confirmation of this through the RPG9 Alteration will be referenced in CC1.</p>	<p>Mod 3.26 (Policy CC1)</p> <p>To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.</p>
	<b>Maidstone</b>		
R9.15	<p>An additional footnote should be added to Policy HP1 to state that the housing provision for Maidstone is a minimum figure subject to the circumstances outlined in paragraph 9.184 above.</p> <p><i>[Para 9.184: For these reasons we consider that any increases in housing provision should be focussed in the town centre near the main public transport nodes and employment centres. It may be that ongoing preparation work for the LDF by MBC will identify more sustainable sites with the potential to increase the dwelling provision locally and this should be encouraged. To achieve this, we consider that the housing provision for Maidstone in the Plan should be expressed as a minimum figure allowing more detailed LDD work and urban capacity studies to inform the LDD preparation process.]</i></p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b></p> <p>It is not felt that the circumstances of Maidstone differ materially from other districts to warrant a specific reference to HP1 figures being a minimum. The expectation is that HP1 figures for <u>all</u> districts are met and thus meeting HP1 is a requirement in all areas informed by urban capacity studies and the criteria for sustainably located development identified in the Structure Plan and national planning guidance.</p> <p>The Panel make no recommendations for change to the quantitative provisions in HP1 for Maidstone.</p>	-

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R9.16	Policy CC2 should be modified by deleting the third paragraph including criteria (i) to (iii) and substituting: "Provision for economic development in Maidstone shall be re-appraised to ensure that sufficient land and floorspace are available to comply with Policy FP1(c)."	Accepted in part.  It is considered important that strategic locational criteria, informing any reappraisal of land provision for economic development at Maidstone, are spelt out and applied to the specific circumstances of the area in this policy.	MOD 3.32 (Policy CC2)
<b>Shepway</b>			
R9.17	Policy CC3 should be modified by adding reference to Link Park, Lypne in the last sentence.	Accepted.	MOD 3.34 (Policy CC3)
R9.18	Policy FP3 should be modified by deleting the reference to Link Park, Lypne.	Accepted.	MOD 6.11 (Policy FP3)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R9.19	<p><b>Canterbury</b></p> <p>Housing requirements for Canterbury should be reviewed with respect to student and incoming employee numbers before the Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Panel's recommendation does not provide any quantitative guidance to inform the review proposed. Although the Panel intend that this review should take account of 'incoming employee numbers' their other recommendations in respect of FP1 and EK1 decline to endorse quantification of new provision for employment land at the city. The Councils propose to adhere to the PEC proposals for employment land at Canterbury and in this regard accept the case for some augmentation in housing provision in Canterbury District, focused at the city, given the current resident/ workforce balance within Canterbury.</p> <p>The influence of students in Canterbury are taken into account through the projections of demographic and household growth that inform the Structure Plan - students form part of the migration flows to/from the City that are taken into account in these projections. The element of the student population not forming part of the private household population is also taken into account throughout the forecasting period. Bespoke provision of student accommodation would not contribute to the general housing provisions for the District under Policy HP1.</p> <p>Modification 7.1 adds 400 dwellings to Canterbury's HP1 housing provision 2006-2016.</p>	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R9.20	Policy EK1 should be modified by the addition of a sentence referring to housing land supply being a matter for enhanced urban capacity unless urban extensions are justified by identified local need for additional housing to balance planned increases in employment.	Accepted in part.  Proposed modification makes reference to enhanced urban capacity but links provision of additional land through Local Development Documents to the need to meet the level of planned provision in the Structure Plan.	MOD 3.18 (Policy EK1)
R9.21	Policy EK1 should be modified to refer to the regeneration of the coalfield settlement of Hersden being generally supported.	Accepted.	MOD 3.21 (Policy EK1)
R9.22	Paragraphs 3.23-24 should be expanded in support of the recommended modifications to Policy EK1.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R9.23	Policy EK1 should be modified to indicate that additional Class B1(a) and (b) employment may be required to meet local business needs but should not quantify this provision.	Accepted in part.  Reference to provision for Use Classes B1a and B1b development and to local business need is accepted.  However, as with Policy FP1 an indication of the scale of land/floorspace provision should also be incorporated. Strategic policy guidance on the scale and location of land for employment and business development at Canterbury is considered appropriate given the guidance within PPG12 and provides a necessary framework for local plan/LDD preparation.	MOD 3.17 (Policy EK1)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
	<b><i>Dover</i></b>		
R9.24	Policy EK2 should be modified by the addition of a new third paragraph providing for approximately 900 new dwellings in Dover and Deal on sites to be identified in the Local Plan.	Accepted.  Modification 7.1 provides for additional 900 dwellings in Dover District in Policy HP1. The policies of the plan for concentration of development at the major/principal urban areas which include Dover and Deal and for the application of a sequential approach which prioritises these settlements (HP4) means that housing provision for Dover District generally (not just the additional provision of 900) should be focused at the urban areas.	MOD 3.24 (Policy EK2) MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)
R9.25	Policy EK2 should be modified by adding in the fourth paragraph after "300", "or more".	Accepted.  Modification 3.24 applies this by reference to a 'minimum of 300 dwellings'.	MOD 3.24 (Policy EK2)
R9.26	Paragraphs 3.25-26 should be modified consistent with the foregoing recommendations [R9.24 & R9.25] and the related paragraphs of this report above.	Accepted.	To be reflected in the redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R9.27	Policy HP1 should be modified to include an additional 900 dwellings in Dover district.	Accepted.  Modification provides for an additional 900 dwellings in Dover District in the 2011-2016 period reflecting also the Panel's comments at para 9.257 of their report.	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
<b><i>Thanet</i></b>			
R9.28	Policy HP1 should be modified to provide for an additional 900 units in Thanet District before 2016.	Accepted.  Modification provides for an additional 900 dwellings in Thanet district in the 2006-2016 period.	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)
<b><i>Tonbridge and Malling</i></b>			
R9.29	Policy HP1 should be modified to give a housing provision for Tonbridge and Malling of 8,700 dwellings.	Accepted.  Modification 7.1 provides for an additional 400 dwellings in Tonbridge and Malling Borough between 2006 and 2016. The context for the figure of 8,700 recommended by the Panel is the reference at para. 9.279 of the report that density gains on existing strategic sites could add c. 300 dwellings to the supply thereby facilitating a total supply of 8,700 for the 2001-2021 period. The Councils consider that the logical and robust interpretation of the Panel's recommendation is that 400 dwellings be added to the HP1 quantity for the pre 2016 period. The Councils note that in making its recommendation the Panel do not propose additional development locations beyond those already identified in the deposit draft of the Structure Plan and there is support (at para 9.295) for the husbanding of Peters Pit (one of the strategic development locations identified in Policy WK3) as a resource for the longer term.	MOD 7.1 (Policy HP1)

## Chapter 10 of Panel Report: Social and Community Infrastructure

Panel Rec. No.	Panel's Recommendations	Kent and Medway Councils' Response	Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)
R10.1	The explanatory text to Policy QL13 should be identified to relate solely to developer obligations.	<b>Not accepted.</b>  This recommendation is confusing as para 10.6 of the Panel's report asserts that QL13 should not relate to developer contributions but deal with the achievement of sustainable communities as a whole.	-
R10.2	Policy QL13 and Policy IMP1 should be cross referenced to each other.	Accepted.	To be achieved in redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R10.3	The title of Policy QL12 should be modified to "The Protection and Enhancement of Existing Community Services".	Accepted.	MOD 5.13 (Policy QL12)
R10.4	Policy QL13 should be modified in accordance with the PEC, save that the first bullet point "associated" should be deleted and replaced with "generated".	Accepted.	MOD 5.16 (Policy QL13)
R10.5	Policy QL13 should be modified by the deletion of "major" in criterion (c) and the inclusion of a paragraph relating to the need for additional prison places.	Accepted in part.  The Councils do not agree that reference be inserted in policy to additional prison places. The submissions received on this matter from the Prison Service do not provide any substantiation of a case of need specific to Kent or underlying locational criteria.  It is agreed that "major" should be deleted from part (c).	MOD 5.18 (Policy QL13)

<b>Panel Rec. No.</b>	<b>Panel's Recommendations</b>	<b>Kent and Medway Councils' Response</b>	<b>Relevant Proposed Modifications Reference (if applicable)</b>
R10.6	Additionally Policies QL12 and QL13 should be modified in line with the PEC.	Accepted.	MOD 5.14 & 15 (Policy QL12) MOD 5.16 & 17 (Policy QL13)
R10.7	Policy IMP1 should be modified in line with the PEC save that the words "and proportionate" should be added after "appropriate" in the first line. Otherwise Policy IMP1 should be modified in accordance with the PEC.	Accepted.	MOD 11.1 (Policy IMP1)
R10.8	The explanatory text to Policy QL13 should be modified to clarify that different uses make differing demands on facilities and infrastructure.	Accepted.	To be reflected in redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R10.9	The explanatory text to Policy IMP1 and Policy QL13 should be modified to make a reference to Chapter 12 of RPG9.	Accepted.	To be reflected in redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan.
R10.10	Paragraph 11.15 explanatory text should be modified to refer to the issues set out in paragraphs B11, B14 and B17 of Circular 1/97.	Accepted.	To be reflected in redrafting of the Explanatory Memorandum prior to adoption of the Plan and provided that Circular 1/97 is still extant.