

Appendix I: Looking Ahead 2018 – Summary of Representations

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| <p>Q3 Scope of the next local plan: Are there any specific matters that you consider the next local plan should be covering or amending from the adopted version?</p> | <p>107</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessing and improving infrastructure problems including transport, healthcare, leisure and civic facilities, public services, utilities and education. This should be dealt with before new development. 2. Environmental issues such as air quality, water, flooding, landscape designations, global warming, the loss of Grade I agricultural land, ancient woodland, the provision of amenity green spaces, SSSIs and biodiversity. 3. Update the brownfield land register and use brownfield sites to reduce housing allocations in the countryside/rural areas/greenfield sites. 4. A close look at the land to the north of Faversham. 5. The impact of Brexit in general and upon population statistics. 6. The lack of technical and managerial jobs 7. Changing demographics, the ageing population and their social/health/housing needs. 8. The design and layout of buildings to create secure and comfortable living environments. 9. Housing figures should be lower than suggested and based on the needs of existing residents and their families and not on an influx of new residents. 10. Kent Science Park should not be allowed to expand; it is not full to capacity currently. 11. Fuller analysis of the jobs being created in London and the south-east as a whole, and the impacts this will have on commuters looking for housing in Swale. 12. Faversham needs to take its fair share of development. The whole borough should be treated equally. 13. Renewable energy generation and management should be more of a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the matters raised will be covered by pieces of evidence base which are referenced more specifically in other questions. However, consideration given to the need for any further evidence not currently identified. • Determination of settlement strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>central issue. (Cleve Hill Solar Park Limited.)</p> <p>14. Greater protection of the AONB and agricultural land. Improved healthcare facilities before considering further population increases, Timely implementation of the upgrade of M2 Junction 5 and the A249. Accurate brownfield land register. Investment in public transport. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>15. The protection of the historic environment and the refresh of the relevant policies in light of the changes to the NPPF. (Historic England.)</p> <p>16. Address a level of growth in line with the Objectively Assessed Need by taking a visionary, creative and positive approach which may require a new interpretation of sustainable development. Strive for design quality of place making. Ensure that growth is viable and translates into built floor space delivered alongside necessary infrastructure. (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.)</p> <p>17. Policy DM 24 of the existing Plan and how the AONB setting is addressed. (Kent Downs AONB Unit.)</p> <p>18. The current local plan should be delivered as agreed last year. Failing to do so would represent a gross waste and misuse of public funds to which Swale BC should be held accountable. (Milstead PC.)</p> <p>19. Robust policies to ensure that biodiversity net gain is achieved, as per the Government's 25 year Environment Plan and the revised NPPF. (Natural England.)</p> <p>20. Removal of the 85/15 split between Sittingbourne and Faversham. Removal of local regional service hubs. (Newington PC.)</p> <p>21. A serious review of the restraint policies which have resulted in very little land being restraint free and able to meet housing requirements. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> <p>22. The current Local Plan is valid, should not be replaced so soon after being adopted and should only be reviewed in light of the infrastructure issues highlighted. There is no justification for new</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>settlements if they are only to support the infrastructure costs associated with an A2/M2 link road and motorway junction and there should be no significantly increased housing figures. Pay heed to the Landscape Designations Review in 2017 and improve protection of special landscapes, agricultural land and the natural environment. Improve healthcare facilities. Assess levels of home working in employment. Spread development evenly around the Borough. Improve the rail infrastructure. New parking standards must be adopted. Up to date brownfield land register. Increase density in major urban areas. Focus on high density employment in mixed used schemes. Urgently upgrade junction 5/A249. (Rodmersham PC and Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>23. Does the plan serve the people of Swale, or is it fulfilling London overspill?</p> <p>24. Heritage should be mentioned as a heritage review is currently being carried out.</p> <p>25. Town centre needs further regeneration (including looking at parking issues).</p> <p>26. No.</p> <p>27. Sittingbourne suffers from bottleneck traffic at rush hour and school times. Road crossing from the north to the southern side of the train station.</p> <p>28. Preventing urban sprawl and limiting the erosion of space between villages so they maintain their own character (protecting important local countryside gaps). Preventing rat running through villages.</p> <p>29. Impact upon energy requirements and natural resources.</p> <p>30. Current plan is valid and should not be replaced with a whole new plan, including new settlements. The current plan should be reviewed in light of existing infrastructure issues, particularly relating to Junction 5 of the M2 and the A249. The upgrade of junction 5 of the M2/A249 will not be complete until 2022 at the earliest. Objection to garden</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>towns or villages and significant increase in housing numbers. No updated Annual Monitoring Report and it is hard to establish current delivery. All infrastructure/facilities/utilities require upgrading. (The Five Parishes Group.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31. The use of trees to absorb air pollutants, shade buildings, conserve water, deter erosion and soften architectural edges. 32. Supports the forward thinking of Looking Ahead. (Faversham TC.) 33. Remove the proposed development in Wises Lane, Sittingbourne. 34. Housing development should be lower than suggested. 35. No, due to the current plan only being adopted in 2017. 36. An update to the SHMAA should be completed. (Kember Loudon Williams.) 37. We cannot have continued growth in both housing and employment. 38. Creating an identity for Sittingbourne. 39. Ensuring that housing need is met. Ensure that delivery is increased. Regeneration and transport. (MLN Land and Properties.) 40. Increased housing need will require the Plan to re-visit many of its fundamental building blocks. (Gladman Developments.) 41. Better understanding of the advantages of custom-build as opposed to self-build. 42. Consider MMO functions during the preparation of the Plan. (The Marine Management Organisation.) | |
| <p>Q4 Evidence for the new local plan: Are there any specific topic areas that you think need further research?</p> | <p>101</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on (and dealing with) infrastructure (road and public transport capacity), air quality, education, the environment, flood risk, noise and light pollution, utilities, public services, healthcare, amenities, general quality of life and biodiversity. 2. Particular transport assessments of Stockbury roundabout and Barton Hill Drive. 3. Update traffic modelling for large housing developments which still have not been built out due to inaccuracies in the past and the fact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the matters raised will be covered by pieces of evidence base which are referenced more specifically in other questions. However, consideration will be given to the need for any further evidence not currently identified. • Determination of settlement |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>this was highlighted as a big issue in the current plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The loss of agricultural land in the light of Brexit and a possible need to be more food self-sufficient. Opportunities to increase the productive use of agricultural land. 5. The preparation of a heritage strategy is welcomed, as there is not one at the moment (Inc. Historic England.) 6. Housing needs, the needs of existing residents, projected increases and the potential for using currently unused accommodation. 7. Employment, including Kent Science Park's aspirations and the use of warehouses which are land hungry but provide little employment. Incentives to attract knowledge industries and small manufacturers which bring prosperity. 8. Review of existing allocations. 9. The public should be engaged in the decisions around hiring consultants rather than relying on developer-led appointments. 10. Housing should be fairly spread around Swale. 11. Any business case should consider a 'do nothing' option. 12. More about people's perceptions. 13. Access to the countryside. 14. A specific strategy for using brownfield sites and empty properties which could take some of the need. 15. Analysis of brick earth deposits, mineral sites and underground water sources. 16. How to proactively provide for electric cars and promote walking/cycling. 17. Economic modelling on the impacts of Brexit. E.g. industrial jobs may be lost and Swale could become more of a commuter feed for London needing better rail links. 18. Impacts of a new Thames crossing. 19. Changing employment patterns to more working from home and access to high speed internet/business links in rural areas. | <p>strategy.</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>20. Impact of greenfield development on water resources. Traffic modelling and air pollution. Building more roads will increase traffic volume not reduce it. Impact of housing growth on all infrastructure/services and requiring a deliverable plan to upgrade them. Creation of a register of flora and fauna. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>21. Good that an updated strategic flood risk assessment is to be carried out. With regards to groundwater and contaminated land, the main things to be looked at are: foul sewer provision in rural areas, SUDS design on brownfield sites, the risk of piling over aquifers and the expansion of cemeteries. (Environment Agency.)</p> <p>22. The deliverability of growth, especially in relation to the transport network, is vital. (Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>23. The Landscape Designation Review should be used to identify valued landscaper in the new plan, including those in the setting of the AONB. (The Kent Downs AONB Unit.)</p> <p>24. A detailed air quality assessment may be required. Furthermore, it may be appropriate to review the green infrastructure strategy to realise the delivery of environmental net gain. (Natural England.)</p> <p>25. Air quality on the A2 corridor, visibility of the priority of brownfield sites – a brownfield land register should be produced, special provision for people down-sizing due to the bedroom tax, the validity of research relating to transport links for settlements. (Newington PC.)</p> <p>26. Review the restraint policies, particularly around the AONB. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> <p>27. Assessment and upgrade of infrastructure including roads, leisure facilities, medical facilities, schools, water supplies and drainage, utilities, broadband services, flora and fauna, geographical features, buffer areas to the AONB and air quality. (Rodmersham PC and The Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>28. Development should not involve the loss, or prejudice the use of, playing fields. The Playing Pitch Strategy should be updated annually.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Sport England's Active Design guidance provides a good opportunity for designing in and promoting physical activity in new development. (Sport England.)</p> <p>29. Assessment of housing needs and possible support from neighbouring Councils to ensure adequacy of resources and infrastructure. Investigate mineral/brickearth sites and water sources and aqueducts. Flora and fauna assessments. The loss of agricultural land, in the light of Brexit. Accessibility of new development to rail links. Infrastructure in place before building. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>30. In the light of changes to national policy, the Council should ensure that evidence relating to allocated sites is robust, up to date and based upon local evidence. This should be carried out on existing allocations too and the Council should be open to removing sites where delivery is uncertain. Where evidence is critical to determining a spatial strategy, it should be updated. (MLN Land and Properties.)</p> <p>31. Agree the new evidence base to underpin the local plan, but the Council should additionally consider detailed evidence on air quality, mineral safeguarding and facilities/demographics in rural settlements. (Gladman Developments.)</p> <p>32. Consider implementing a more flexible approach to remove designated local green spaces that can be developed more suitably whilst retaining an element of green space. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>33. The standardised approach to calculating housing need will have a significant impact upon Swale and a broad range of sites will be needed to meet the challenging target. The need for employment land should not be neglected. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>34. Providing actual affordable homes rather than just saying they are.</p> <p>35. Impact upon small historic villages.</p> <p>36. How will recycling and waste be handled with the increased population?</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>37. What youth services will be provided?</p> <p>38. Northern relief road must be completed, particularly for the residents of Great Easthall. A junction 5a (M2) would enhance this more by reducing traffic in the congested areas.</p> <p>39. The Brett Associates report is biased towards garden towns and does not fully explore the alternatives. The population assumptions upon which the report is based are questionable and require research, particularly in the light of Brexit.</p> <p>40. No.</p> <p>41. Understand why people do not shop in Sittingbourne.</p> <p>42. Look at how to ensure more people see these consultations e.g. through media coverage.</p> <p>43. Planning applications rely on developer supplied information which is biased towards their own objectives.</p> <p>44. The potential for Sheppey, which appears to have been ignored/played down.</p> <p>45. The development of north Sittingbourne in a waste management area of regional importance needs to be considered and whether this has been referred to in the Kent County Council Minerals and Waste Plan.</p> <p>46. Lorry parking.</p> <p>47. Custom-build site requirements and how to promote this provision which is increasing.</p> | |
| <p>Q5 The big future questions: We have provided just a small digest of some of the big challenges that may face us. This is your chance to</p> | <p>89</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no mention of Brexit, national governments and how they might impact upon immigration and housing need. 2. Worker flexibility may reduce commuting and result in a demand for additional local services such as leisure facilities, which are lacking in Swale. 3. No greenfield development should take place until a full study of local wildlife and migratory bird habits has been carried out. 4. The effects of new growth on air quality. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the matters raised will be covered by pieces of evidence base which are referenced more specifically in other questions. However, consideration will be given to the need for any further evidence not currently identified. • Determination of settlement |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| tell us your own thoughts about what the future may mean for us. What do you think? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Infrastructure for electric and autonomous vehicles. 6. Telecommunications infrastructure, particularly in rural areas. 7. Build on brownfield sites first/only. 8. Social care, housing needs and environmental issues are all important. Building dense housing with small gardens encourages people to escape to open areas. 9. Swale's greatest asset is its heritage, character and ancient landscapes which could all be lost under garden towns and sprawling housing estates. 10. Over-optimistic view of the switch to electric vehicles. Longevity of current vehicles. HGVs and diesel vehicles. Air quality issues will increase or persist. Concerned that housing is only viable with the correct infrastructure. (Newington PC.) 11. Agricultural land should be preserved in light of Brexit. This and the unsettled Asian and USA markets which will result in us needing to be more food self-sufficient. 12. Infrastructure must be prioritised over housing. Roads, railways, education, healthcare, pollution, terrorism, recycling, air quality and links with Europe all need reviewing. 13. Understand and quantify population projections so a brief can be developed identifying what type of housing and services will be needed. 14. Climate change is hard to predict. Sea level rise and dramatic weather patterns will have an impact on Swale in terms of flooding and sewage infrastructure. This is particularly an issue considering that garden villages/urban extensions would be built over agricultural land, changing the area's hydrology. 15. The local plan should promote the opportunities for renewable energy that Swale has to offer, particularly around solar and wind, with as few obstacles as possible, as per the NPPF. (Cleve Hill Solar Park Ltd.) 16. Climate change, food production, water supply. Preservation and | strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>planning to maximise the use of natural resources must be top priority. Agricultural land and water catchment land must be given the strongest possible protection. Must not take other Council's housing allocations. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>17. The historic environment has the potential to contribute to sustainability through the re-use and adaption of historic buildings, parks, gardens and scheduled monuments. (Historic England.)</p> <p>18. Future plan making should focus on vision, creativity and building on the opportunities for growth and expansion, which should take proper account of higher value locations which can self-fund infrastructure provision, resolve highway issues and secure quality place-making. This will lead to greater investment confidence and trickle down to areas in need of regeneration. Niche housing, green technology, sustainable construction and reducing car use alongside improving public transport are all key issues. (Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>19. To meet the borough's future needs, greenfield development will be necessary, particularly in the eastern part, around Faversham and Boughton. (Redrow Homes.)</p> <p>20. The population values access to environmental resources, one such resource is the AONB whose resilience is under threat. The emerging plan must incorporate the environmental net gain principle. (The Kent Downs AONB Unit.)</p> <p>21. Difficult to address the issues while the NPPF has not been finalised or until the major infrastructure projects around the M2/Junction5/A249 have been delivered. The new Thames crossing will exacerbate traffic on the M2 and new settlements would damage local road infrastructure further, as agreed by Highways England during the last local plan examinations. Education and training, healthy housing development, healthcare, water supply, air quality and changing demographics are all key issues. (Rodmersham PC and The Five Parishes Group.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>22. Impacts of Brexit, job creation in the Thames Gateway, demographics and housing type. Sittingbourne as a market town. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>23. The delivery of housing should be considered as one of the big challenges for the plan to address. (MLN Land and Properties.)</p> <p>24. Ensuring enough deliverable land is allocated in the right places, with the right quality housing. Promoting the right sort of employment space. Anticipating and guiding technological innovation in the transport sector. Addressing the future of town centres. Providing the right infrastructure at the right time. (Duchy of Cornwall.)</p> <p>25. The local plan should recognise the value of smaller employment sites and not risk their decline to larger ones. The focus on housing should not be solely on need but also on how the need will be met in a continuous and sustainable way. Climate change, renewable energy and how infrastructure will accommodate additional supply are key issues. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>26. Fairer development split across the area, i.e. in Faversham.</p> <p>27. Footpaths to be kept clear.</p> <p>28. Great weight should be given to proposals which incorporate significant communal green/leisure space and biodiversity gains. Walking and cycling need to have greater significance in promoting health. Transport which become less of an issue as greener technologies develop.</p> <p>29. Located business here due to the rural nature. This may not be able to continue in light of increased expansion.</p> <p>30. Swale needs to be bold to prevent Sittingbourne becoming a commuter down. Infrastructure needs to be planned in advance.</p> <p>31. There should be villages specifically for older people which would free up existing housing stock and provide them with a better environment. People in areas at risk of flooding in the future will need re-homing.</p> <p>32. The Borough as it is should be made as good as it can be before more development occurs.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>33. Increases in artificial intelligence and automation will increase the demand for leisure facilities. Dealing with the ageing population and clean growth are also key issues.</p> <p>34. How will Swale maintain its mix of rural and suburban areas?</p> <p>35. The northern powerhouse and other similar regional linkups would be better rather than continuing to feed the exceeded critical mass in London and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>36. Crime.</p> <p>37. All new builds should have solar panels.</p> <p>38. Retaining and improving the character of the area.</p> <p>39. Changes in transport and how it is used.</p> <p>40. The development of completely new communities seems the only viable way forward but it must be balanced with the loss of agricultural land and biodiversity.</p> <p>41. Affordable homes are required now and should be built in small lots so as to avoid creating slum areas. We will need to accept mass migration from countries most impacted by climate change, but they must be spread evenly around the country.</p> <p>42. Protection of agricultural land, particularly the land south of the A2 between Sittingbourne and Faversham.</p> | |
| <p>Q6 Swale's Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats: Do you agree with this analysis of Swale's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and</p> | <p>90</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The potential labour issues as a result of our departure from the EU cannot be proved. 2. The impact of a direct rail link between Faversham and Ashford upon the AONB. (Kent Downs AONB Unit) 3. Swale has strong creative and cultural activity for example Sheppey Little Theatre and Avenue Theatre as well as cinemas, pubs and community centres. (Theatres Trust) 4. Area becoming less pleasant to live due to the amount of fly-tipping. 5. Why consider building over greenfield sites if positives are horticultural fruit production and outstanding natural environments and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the matters raised will be covered by pieces of evidence base which are referenced more specifically in other questions. However, consideration will be given to the need for any further evidence not currently identified. • Determination of settlement strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| threats? If not, what should be added or taken away? | | <p>weaknesses are congestion and poor air quality.</p> <p>6. There is a contradiction in saying that migration from London is both an opportunity and a threat. This migration is putting pressure on the rail network which is at or over capacity. Skilled people will not migrate from London because they can afford to live there. Those that do may be taking advantage of cheaper housing and still commute to London therefore not expanding Swale's skill base. It is a threat.</p> <p>7. Kent Science Park does not deliver the high employment opportunities suggested and the proposed junction 5a on the M2 would result in a significant increase in warehouse/distribution and lorry parking amounting to an inappropriate use of agricultural land which could be better used in the rural economy. There should however be improvements to the existing junction 5. It is not accepted that there is a dwindling supply of employment land. More attention should be paid to the management and accuracy of the Brownfield Land Register. (Inc. Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>8. Heritage assets are a strength that could be used as an opportunity to provide attractive environments. There is however a threat from poorly managed growth that can detract from the same assets. (Historic England)</p> <p>9. The weaknesses identified can be turned around with more confidence in the area and education/skilling of the workforce. There is a lack of further education. Poor land values are an opportunity to attract inward investment. (Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>10. Future housing growth should not be seen as a threat, but as an opportunity to foster economic growth, improve skill levels, and capture higher land values as a means to addressing the need for community services. (Redrow Homes.)</p> <p>11. We should develop the creative job opportunities market through educational establishment developments.</p> <p>12. Swale BC should preserve the rural identity of the area and should not</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>take any housing allocations from other boroughs. Current allocations should be spread more fairly and evenly.</p> <p>13. There should be an equivalent analysis for each of the three main areas, Sheppey, Faversham and Sittingbourne, to the correct imbalance and inequalities.</p> <p>14. SWOT analysis is an outdated tool.</p> <p>15. Vegetation is cut down and often not replaced.</p> <p>16. Noise and light pollution should be kept to a minimum.</p> <p>17. Milton Creek Country Park is a great amenity but not easily accessible.</p> <p>18. Local health services and the nearest hospitals are at capacity.</p> <p>19. Yes. (Inc. Newington PC and OSG Architecture Ltd)</p> <p>20. Brownfield sites should be built on before greenfield sites.</p> <p>21. Infrastructure must be prioritised over housing and to add more housing would exacerbate the existing issues such as road, rail, parking, healthcare and education capacity problems.</p> <p>22. Greater assessment of opportunities represented by solar resources should be made, as Kent receives some of the highest levels of solar irradiation in the UK and is ideally placed to take advantage of developments in solar energy. Swale's proximity to important elements of national grid infrastructure is a valuable asset that is a major constraint that energy developers must face. (Cleve Hill Solar Park Limited.)</p> <p>23. The natural environment is a huge asset and opportunity which is not recognised. The economic benefit and the health and wellbeing benefit from people engaging with their local environment should be considered a huge opportunity. (Natural England)</p> <p>24. The analysis is sound but the crucial issue is whether the Council is genuinely prepared to tackle them. Allocating land for housing is difficult and the key issue is whether there is the political will for these matters to be addressed. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>25. Any future large scale development would move strengths to weaknesses and opportunities to threats. Certain employment sites are given a higher profile, e.g. Kent Science Park which provides at best 1,800 jobs when other more important employment sites such as the "Sittingbourne Hub" area around Eurolink and the northern part of Sittingbourne/Kemsley Mill area provides in excess of 18,000 jobs. Swale BC should be careful how it prioritises these employment sites. Sittingbourne and Faversham would be swamped by any proposed Garden Town or Village development. (The Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>26. Strengths should include: HS1 link with 4/5 main line stations in the Borough, good choice of selective and non-selective secondary schools, the beauty and tranquillity of the villages, Eurolink as a previous brownfield area where small and large businesses can thrive and excellent village schools with outstanding Ofsted reports. Sittingbourne as a market town should be encouraged along with Faversham. The natural environment is a strength not an opportunity. Large scale development would reverse strengths to weaknesses. The next generation of land owners may not wish to farm. The Government needs to support farmers, especially around the issue of Brexit. Opportunity lies in jobs being created in the Thames Gateway. A threat lies in London social housing with the requirement of additional support and funding. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>27. Question the inclusion of migration from London as a threat. It should be seen as an opportunity and it is highly likely that this trend will continue. (MLN Land and Properties.)</p> <p>28. Opportunities should include the development of sites that are well related and connected to villages. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>29. The role that successful small employment sites play, such as Newington Industrial Estate, has been missed. There are significant opportunities for low carbon power sources and the Borough is well placed to be a focus for the renewable sector. (W.T Lamb Holdings)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Ltd.)</p> <p>30. Disagree with concept of 'relatively cheap houses', which are always relative to income and the ability to service a mortgage. Local wages are low compared to London and therefore local people will be unable to obtain large enough mortgages. This will result in Londoners migrating to Kent.</p> <p>31. Disagree that Swale should be encouraging large distribution centres and business parks as they attract cheap labour, heavy lorries, air pollution and congestion. Disagree that there is a dwindling supply of employment land with the potential to re-use brownfield sites. Housing growth would not be poorly managed unless Swale BC allows it to be.</p> <p>32. A lack of foresight about how things are going to go in an overcrowded area.</p> <p>33. Opportunities are underwhelming and unimaginative.</p> <p>34. The resulting priorities and emphasis may be flawed and not from a community level.</p> <p>35. Swale BC is influenced by business people and not listening to the ordinary people.</p> <p>36. Inadequate and overall lack of leisure facilities. Poor accessibility to Milton Creek and The White Horse Wood Country Park. The high speed is no faster than the normal trains and the roads are congested. There is no thought of future proofing in the planned junction 5 upgrade. Apart from cheaper housing there is little to commend the area. If plans go ahead for a "garden village" then huge investment is required in leisure, retail, employment and infrastructure.</p> <p>37. There is no consideration of employment, industrial and commercial development in Faversham or any mention of strengths etc. that relate to Faversham. The analysis is predicated on Sittingbourne and Sheppey. Development needs to incorporate the coastal offering which is not considered.</p> <p>38. The state of the High Street is a weakness and threat.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>39. Lack of understanding about the potential for Sheppey's history. No real tangible changes here for a number of years.</p> <p>40. There is no vision for what Swale wants to be.</p> <p>41. The town regeneration seems to be only an increase in food outlets and low end shops. High speed trains do not speed up access to London and there is no direct access to the continent. The proposed housing may not be very attractive.</p> <p>42. Poorly managed growth has already led to transport, social infrastructure and environmental pressures which will only be worsened and are the reason why business growth potential is poor. Investment stays away because of Sittingbourne's poor image. It should be marketed as an affluent market town with emphasis on the historic High Street and countryside. There is missed potential in the historic town of Milton Regis which is lost amongst industry and over development.</p> <p>43. New housing has been focused in town centres to the detriment of investment in rural areas which are now declining in services and infrastructure. There is an opportunity in controlled village and hamlet expansion.</p> <p>44. The Sheppey crossing should have been a tunnel not a bridge so it stays open. No southern relief road to the M2. M2 should have been upgraded to 3 lanes. Where are the doctors and schools?</p> <p>45. Swale's biggest asset is its fantastic location in the county with key access to places if the road infrastructure could be sorted.</p> <p>46. Lack of further education.</p> <p>47. Main strength is the available land close to London but only if the transport infrastructure is in place. Swale should seek this infrastructure from central government.</p> <p>48. Business parks are not strengths and Kent Science Park is not meeting its goals of bringing in skilled workers and is under immense pressure from competition parks. Sittingbourne town centre must be a</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>priority to keep the community viable. Land values should not be a barrier to investment.</p> <p>49. Large warehousing tends to be low paid job and produces heavy lorry traffic. Heritage strength is limited. The latest highways agency plan for junction 5 improvements means the proposal for junction 5a would not be needed. Storage of power could be a great opportunity especially using newer technologies such as liquefied air systems.</p> <p>50. The strength of our high grade agricultural land (and mild, relatively dry climatic conditions) is mostly ignored and will be a massive opportunity post-Brexit in terms of self-sufficiency, improved landscapes and biodiversity. A new Bill is expected later this year to preserve and improve the health of the UK soils. This is one of the most important parts of sustainable development. Not enough is being done to ensure that planning conditions are properly adhered to.</p> <p>51. Pollution is a major threat that will increase with new housing and has serious health implications which need addressing. Advances in technology and artificial intelligence places a threat on employment opportunities. London migration will place further pressure on our transport infrastructure.</p> <p>52. The number of volunteers is reducing. There is an absence of social and really affordable housing and there is slow delivery on allocated sites where developers are maximising value by restricting supply. There needs to be a look at the mix of homes being built in Faversham.</p> <p>53. There is no mention of cycling or walking which have the potential to reduce traffic in town centres.</p> <p>54. Disagree that there is cheap land and house prices, that there is an open and flexible environment for businesses to thrive or that there is strong cultural activity (unless you live in Faversham). A lot has been spent on maintaining Faversham's heritage but the same has not happened for Sittingbourne. Disagree that there are outstanding</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>natural environments. Sittingbourne town centre regeneration will not make it any better than it is. There will be shops of no substance and a new cinema is not required.</p> <p>55. Contradictions in the analysis such as saying a strength is the cultural activity but a weakness is the underdeveloped cultural offer. How can poor land values limit the potential for high quality development. The regeneration doesn't create more wealth just redistributes the retail spend. Brexit is an opportunity for both high and low skilled people to find work.</p> <p>56. Very few people want to be out in the town centres at night time. The rail link between Faversham and Ashford might benefit the people of Faversham, if it ever happens. The current services need to be improved. Scepticism regarding Sittingbourne town centre regeneration.</p> | |
| <p>Q7 The next generation of employment sites: Where should we be locating the next generation of employment sites?</p> | <p>66</p> | <p>Sittingbourne</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sittingbourne town centre, around Milton Creek and land to the north of Sittingbourne train station. 2. Re-develop and clean up Milton Creek, as it currently puts potential employers off. 3. Expand the Eurolink Castle Road industrial estate, but ensure there is a sufficient road capacity. 4. Not in gridlocked Sittingbourne. 5. To the North of Sittingbourne where there are easy access to sea, rail and road connections. 6. Use redundant brownfield sites such as part of the Eurolink Estate. 7. Sittingbourne needs to adopt a USP and develop Sport and Art facilities to attract employers. <p>Sheppey</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Adjacent to the Port of Sheerness. 9. Anywhere on the Isle of Sheppey. 10. Sheppey, Medway and other port towns need to be focussed on. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These responses will need to be looked at in conjunction with the recently finalised Employment Land Review. • Members will need to give a steer as to where to locate new employment allocations. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Faversham</p> <p>11. M2 Junction 7 opens up an area in Faversham east, Brenley corner and along either side of the A2 and Boughton and Selling (with an under used rail station.)</p> <p>12. Suitable sites near/between Faversham & Canterbury are available.</p> <p>13. Land available at Oare Road.</p> <p>Elsewhere</p> <p>14. Better site accommodation needed for agricultural workers (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>15. J5a will give the Science Park and Teynham distribution hub an opportunity to grow.</p> <p>16. Kent Science Park should be included when considering future employment sites as it's preferable to sustain and expand established employment hubs which benefit from clustering. (Quinn Estates Ltd.) Kent Science Park has capacity.</p> <p>17. Kent Science Park is unsuitable due to poor access.</p> <p>18. Promote the use of subsidised small scale farms.</p> <p>19. Newington Industrial Estate has the ability to be extended in a sustainable manner and should be developed in preference to new sites. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>Other Locational Points</p> <p>20. Adjacent to the motorway/main roads, rail links and local ports.</p> <p>21. Develop and invest in the Swale, dredge Milton and Faversham creeks and develop waterfront leisure, industry and homes.</p> <p>22. Swale already has sufficient employment sites.</p> <p>23. Brownfield, close to transport links. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>24. There is sufficient brownfield land within the borough to support future employment. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>25. Make more of our waterfront locations.</p> <p>26. Priority should be given to existing employment sites.</p> <p>27. Located close to existing housing.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>28. Use existing sites to their full potential.</p> <p>29. Employment growth is spatially more footloose. (Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>30. Good public transport corridors between housing areas and employment nodes. (Inc. Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>31. Local wages do not provide enough money for young people to get on the housing ladder.</p> <p>32. Large scale distribution can damage landscape and should be located away from the AONB and its setting. (Kent Downs AONB.)</p> <p>33. Sites with the least ecological and landscape impacts should be used for employment use. (Natural England.)</p> <p>34. Need to be in locations sought by employers. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> <p>35. Release land in smaller settlements and in deprived communities. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> <p>36. Mixed with housing and located in town centres and using brownfield sites to a higher density. (Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>37. The whole model of employment will change due to technology and this needs to be factored into any modelling.</p> <p>38. Small employment units in our empty High Street.</p> <p>39. Employment in town centres to sustain retail and leisure. Each urban town centre must have specific regeneration plans. (Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>40. Equally spread across our borough.</p> <p>41. Not in the AONB or Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>42. Smaller offices on or near industrial estates as they generate more jobs.</p> <p>43. No green belt or agricultural land should be used for employment.</p> <p>44. This depends on the type of employment being discussed.</p> <p>45. The types of employment require more thought, rather than just where.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>46. Is vital for SBC to allocate employment sites that deliver the necessary employment uses. (The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd (c/o Revera Ltd.))</p> <p>Other Points</p> <p>47. There will be more homeworking. (Bredgar PC, Rodmersham PC, Tunstall PC, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>48. We have enough, Sittingbourne is at capacity with the current infrastructure.</p> <p>49. There will be more London commuter based residents.</p> <p>50. What is the evidence for the forecast for Swale's economy to improve?</p> <p>51. Opportunities to increase employment within agriculture, tourism and artisanal activities should be sought. (Bredgar PC, Rodmersham PC, Tunstall PC, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>52. SBC is using a methodology based on landowner profits rather than community needs. (Newington Parish Council.)</p> <p>53. Not knowing the potential outcomes of Brexit will be limit decisions relating to investments in industry and training.</p> <p>54. Investment in skilled work on existing sites should be a priority.</p> <p>55. Swale overplays people commuting to London. (Newington Parish Council.)</p> <p>56. The inter-relationship of housing growth and economic growth need to be considered holistically and not in isolation. (Redrow Homes.)</p> <p>57. Better employment hubs across the borough. (Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>58. SBC should meet its employment needs within Swale. (Maidstone BC.)</p> <p>59. Who will provide the next generation employment sites?</p> <p>60. Improve employment type and density by actively encouraging reuse/recycling of employment sites to higher densities and pursue more office developments in the urban town centres. (Rodmersham</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>PC and Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>61. Warehouses provide relatively few jobs and are a poor use of Swale's employment land and create traffic. (Rodmersham PC and Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>62. There needs to be more mixed-use areas with both employment and housing.</p> <p>Sites submitted for consideration:</p> <p>63. Lamberhurst Farm, Dargate; 22.5 hectares, business-type campus with between 150,000 and 200,000 sq ft of predominantly B1 floorspace and residential development on 6.5 hectares. (LandCap.)</p> <p>64. 2 sites for any form of strategic development from residential to commercial. Site 1 - Foresters Lodge Farm and land, Foresters Farm, Dunkirk, ME13 9LG and Site 2 - Land off Canterbury Road (adj. Village Hall) (OSG Architecture Ltd.)</p> | |
| <p>Q8 The Swale economy: Do you agree with our assessment of what we need to provide to ensure that the economy is sustained? How can Swale ensure that its current positive economic forecasts come to fruition and are sustained?</p> | <p>66</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree. (Inc. OSG Architecture Ltd, Newington Parish Council) 2. Strong, diverse retail offering, which is not readily available online. 3. Restaurants and cultural activities in town centres. 4. Strive for a diversified economic base, including a choice of employment sites. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 5. Recognise the role of leisure, and tourism/holiday accommodation and farm diversification. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 6. Mix job creation through light industry units into housing development to reduce travel time and pollution. 7. Further consideration of the economic benefits from Swale's rich environmental heritage as part of Swale's economy. (Natural England.) 8. Sittingbourne has too many industrial sites; those in disrepair should be renewed. 9. New sites is not the answer, we must be more efficient. 10. Ensure that links by sea, rail and road are improved; especially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These responses will need to be looked at in conjunction with the recently finalised Employment Land Review. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Sheerness and Ridham Docks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Build on brownfield, not greenfield. 12. Attracting skilled people into the area does not help the unskilled to find work. 13. An up-skilling of existing residents is needed and an FE college in Sittingbourne and Faversham. (Inc. Bredgar PC.) 14. To create real wealth in an area we have to create goods or services that are needed elsewhere. 15. Suitable high-quality housing must be provided for business owners and entrepreneurs. 16. Improve Sittingbourne High Street. (Bredgar Parish Council) 17. Free transport to Canterbury. (Newington Parish Council) 18. The Council will need to provide sufficient floorspace in its varying forms in appropriate locations. (Peter Court Associates) 19. Small businesses, often where people work from their homes, are the life-blood of the local economy. (Peter Court Associates) 20. Don't waste money on Spirit of Sittingbourne. 21. Look at Swale's history with regards to ability on forecasting. 22. Swale has little currently to attract quality people and more needs to be made of the coastal areas for leisure. A large upmarket marina is needed. 23. Sittingbourne is emphasising on the wrong kind of employment; heavy industry is no long suitable or beneficial and is a blight on infrastructure and the environment. 24. The spread of development should be allocated more evenly around the borough. 25. Kent Science Park has good facilities and could attract more employment. 26. A better mix of jobs across Sittingbourne is needed. 27. Need to rebrand Sittingbourne to make more of history and provide new heritage building. | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>28. Existing facilities and infrastructure needs upgrading first. Key is to overcome the infrastructure constraints which hold back economic activity e.g. the completion of the Northern Relief Road. (Inc. Quinn Estates Ltd.)</p> <p>29. Reduce cost of travel to and from London.</p> <p>30. In the longer term become candidate site for Elon Musk hyperloop concept.</p> <p>31. How many food stores does one town need?</p> <p>32. Creatively develop Sittingbourne High Street; high quality living accommodation, independent retailers/cafes/restaurants, a museum. (Inc. Bredgar PC and Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>33. Sittingbourne has a thriving economy, Faversham does not and it would be beneficial for them to have more industry opportunities.</p> <p>34. Points 7.2.4 - 7.2.7 are good and insightful.</p> <p>35. Swale needs a USP via creating centres of excellence in particular sectors. "The Garden of England" is an unexploited brand.</p> <p>36. Opportunities for social and cultural interaction help attract and retain talent and support other businesses. (Theatres Trust.)</p> <p>37. Too subjective and a poorly phrased question. You should be looking at how Swale sits with its peers and its relationship to London. (Rodmersham Parish Council, Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>38. Provide a proper museum in Sittingbourne. (Tunstall Parish Council.)</p> <p>39. Encouragement for local cafes in the rural areas. (Tunstall Parish Council.)</p> <p>40. The Port of Sheerness is a major source of employment in Swale, both directly and indirectly. (Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd.)</p> <p>41. Agrees the LP must provide sufficient opportunities to ensure that the economy of Swale is sustained. (Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>42. There is also a need to ensure that the lower value uses, which in some instance support the higher value uses, are not ignored and form an integral part of the LP's economic strategy. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>43. The Government is committed to the 'Northern Power House' and therefore work opportunities will be shifting north.</p> <p>44. Infrastructure first.</p> <p>45. In Faversham, need to improve the retail/banking/office and restaurant centre.</p> <p>46. Provide good linkages to town centres.</p> <p>47. We can expect more people to be self-employed and working from home.</p> <p>48. The question is unfocussed and too generalised.</p> <p>49. More focus on vocational skills.</p> <p>50. What are you doing to attract more businesses into the area?</p> <p>51. Your assessment does not show what steps you are taking to grow the economy.</p> <p>52. The need for housing in the area should be driven by an improved economy and job prospects.</p> <p>53. In 2038 shopping will be on line and distribution centres can be out of town.</p> <p>54. Swale should seek to increase local employment opportunities across the Borough for all skill levels.</p> <p>55. Brexit will change all economic forecasts.</p> <p>56. Super-fast broadband is needed throughout.</p> <p>57. The assessment is based on speculation.</p> <p>58. The key issue is that of quality.</p> <p>59. Yes, we need to sustain the economy but not at the expense of destroying rural communities.</p> | |
| Q9 Making our | 64 | 1. Better and more diverse education opportunities, especially further | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the suggestions are |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p>communities more resilient: What will Swale need to do to make its most deprived communities more resilient in the face of future economic change?</p> | | <p>education, for children and adults, especially in entrepreneurialism. (Inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC and Tunstall PC.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Create more inclusive communities, engage them and create community leaders. 3. Apprentices and work experience should be valued. 4. By ensuring that any economic development is guided by the skills and qualifications of the workforce. 5. Deprived areas such as Murston need more social input. 6. Improve rail links to Isle of Sheppey to increase residents work opportunities. 7. A radical change to business rates to encourage businesses into Swale. 8. Spend on health and social care and provide efficient, good quality and responsive Borough and County council services. 9. Better rural internet and phone coverage and high speed WiFi throughout Swale. 10. Climate change is likely to be much more important, even with the problems of "Brexit." 11. Provide affordable housing. 12. Encourage more companies to build in the area by offering incentives to companies to use local labour. 13. A strong service sector will not work unless the value has been added elsewhere. 14. Garden/allotment schemes. 15. Enhanced investment into Sittingbourne & Sheerness Town Centres with a strategic vision for them. 16. The creation of small enterprise funds to encourage SME set up. 17. Regeneration of existing housing estates with more sport, leisure and cultural facilities. 18. Positive discrimination in planning and investment towards deprived communities. | <p>unable to be delivered through the planning system so the Council will need to liaise with other agencies (such as KCC Education, BIS, the Treasury.)</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>19. Deprived communities are in this position as they offer cheap affordable accommodation and improve transport improvements in these areas. If they are that deprived understand why and rectify.</p> <p>20. There should be specific plans for the most deprived neighbourhoods. (Five Parishes Group and Rodmersham PC.)</p> <p>21. Litter groups cleaning beaches and parks.</p> <p>22. Ensure adequate funds for day care centres.</p> <p>23. Swale's greenspace and green infrastructure strategy can help with resident's health and wellbeing if an integrated approach is included through the LP. (Natural England.)</p> <p>24. SBC needs to invest the same level of care and attention in Sittingbourne and Sheerness as Faversham. It may be necessary to re-organise local government and funding to achieve this. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council.)</p> <p>25. Stamp out drugs, and more policing at night.</p> <p>26. Reduce the growth of permanent caravan towns in the countryside for fruit pickers.</p> <p>27. Improve the infrastructure to encourage investment, pay proper wages, and reduce reliance on benefits and the state.</p> <p>28. Make sure transport is cheap and available and reliable.</p> <p>29. The NHS, Social Services, Schools, Police, Business and Swale need to work together as a team to minimise deprivation. There needs to be a complete re-vamp of the national social and healthcare offer.</p> <p>30. The deprived are more concerned with having a decent roof over their heads than living in an affluent area.</p> <p>31. Highsted Park will provide a wide range of employment opportunities and a general increase in job opportunities. (Quinn Estates Ltd.)</p> <p>32. Increasing the provision of housing is crucial to addressing this problem as it will stimulate the economy. (Peter Court Associates.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | 33. There will be trickle-down growth from the development successes of the district. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 34. Growth should be across the Borough? (Inc. Newington Parish Council, Five Parishes Group and Rodmersham PC.) | |
| Q10 Our town centres: What do you think the future planning policy should be toward our town centres, in particular, how can we ensure that the areas beyond the core retail areas remain vibrant and how can we ensure the vitality and viability of our centres as a whole? | 70 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Free parking to ease congestion, a park and ride scheme, an integrated transport system and good public transport. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council, The Five Parishes Group, Hume Planning Consultancy.) 2. Build on brownfield sites. 3. Ensure they are safe, clean and attractive. 4. SBC to have a display/stands locally to engage with the public. 5. Future High Street will be about leisure/amenities. 6. Encourage pleasant and safe walking/cycling routes in and pedestrianize Sittingbourne High Street. 7. Change streets like East Street, West Street and the High Street in Sittingbourne to housing. 8. Higher density, build on supermarket roofs and shops, flats above shops. (Inc. Rodmersham Parish Council, Rodmersham Parish Council) 9. Encourage pop up shops and craft centres in empty stores. 10. Get rid of gambling places and charity shops. 11. A reactive policy to what the Town needs at anyone given time. 12. Re-use shops as offices and office cubicles for rent. 13. Low cost units for start-up businesses in the creative tech industry. 14. Apart from Faversham, improve the cultural side of the town centres. 15. More parks. 16. Consider impact of multi-nationals on small, local businesses. 17. Areas of affordable housing, easily accessible by foot/cycle. 18. Encourage a mix of retail/restaurants/housing/cultural. (Bredgar Parish Council, The Five Parishes Group) 19. Reduce building rents and business rates. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will need to take into account the results of the Retail and Leisure Study which is in hand. • Member steer may be required required on more flexible planning policies for town centres (as supported by the NPPF) |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20. CPO empty units. 21. Build a large, out of town retail centre. Furniture stores and larger goods retailers are better in retail parks where parking is easier to collect goods. 22. Stop building on car parks. 23. Introduce more social ventures where people can meet and chat in the High Street. 24. The Government needs to implement a tax system across online sellers to rebalance the costs associated with High Street/Town Centre shops. 25. Heritage and cultural resources can make a positive contribution to the revitalisation and enhancement of town centres. Recycling of historic buildings for active cultural and economic uses can support regeneration of town centres. (Historic England.) 26. The focus on Town Centre policy is outmoded and exasperated by high parking charges. (Newington Parish Council.) 27. Allow more flexible leisure, residential and community uses. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 28. Set up a scheme for small retailers to encourage them back to the town centre by offering incentives 29. Exploit what already exists. 30. There is missed potential with linking up Sittingbourne High Street and the historic town of Milton Regis. 31. Individual shops should be encouraged. (Inc. Rodmersham Parish Council, The Five Parishes Group) 32. Need to encourage existing traders to stay and improve. 33. Concentrate on improving what we have; Sittingbourne High Street has some beautiful buildings. 34. Consider an upmarket, high quality, approach to attract independent successful businesses. 35. Consider future shopping/living habits and to adapt accordingly. | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>36. Preserve integrity of the buildings in the town centres with policies to enforce landlords to clean up old properties that are becoming derelict and dilapidated.</p> <p>37. Sittingbourne Sheerness and Faversham should each have a bespoke regeneration/town plan. (Inc. Rodmersham Parish Council)</p> <p>38. Good pedestrian access and areas.</p> <p>39. There are NO core retail areas, the Council have ignored this for decades.</p> <p>40. Clean up what we have before spending OUR money on any new developments.</p> <p>41. Re-establish Chamber of Commerce or similar support groups.</p> <p>42. Total upgrade of all Swale leisure centres.</p> <p>43. Should not vastly expand our population and turn areas into commuter dormitories and keep the focus on local employment/and facilities.</p> <p>44. In Sittingbourne any events are focussed on one end of the high street and not the full length.</p> <p>45. There needs to be greater promotion of the history of the individual buildings to bring pride and want people to take an interest.</p> <p>46. The future is developing compact smart growth in cities.</p> <p>47. Shops are needed in the town centre because many people cannot afford to travel to out of town retail centres like Bluewater.</p> <p>48. Encourage boutique shops to Sittingbourne along the lines of Whitstable and Faversham.</p> <p>49. In Sittingbourne the retail footprint is not large enough to encourage large retail outlets.</p> <p>50. Future business opportunities are likely to be driven by technology and tourism. (Bredgar Parish Council)</p> <p>51. SBC to purchase high street retail properties to ensure low rents.</p> <p>52. Assistance with improving the look of the current High Street, some extremely architecturally attractive buildings need restoring. (Tunstall PC.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | 53. A total upgrade of leisure facilities in the town centre i.e. the Swallows. (Tunstall Parish Council.) 54. SBC needs to implement policies that improve the maintenance and management of our town centres. (Bredgar Parish Council) 55. Planning policies must improve the quality and density of housing near town centres. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council, Rodmersham Parish Council) 56. Each town Sheerness, Sittingbourne and Faversham should have their own regeneration/town plans. (Inc. Rodmersham Parish Council, The Five Parishes Group.) | |
| Q11 Existing strategic employment locations: How can the economic and other opportunities of our existing strategic employment locations be more fully realised? | 54 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure must be in place, especially the road network. (Inc. Hume Planning Consultancy.) 2. Use brownfield sites. (inc. The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council.) 3. Create a plan, support it with resources including finance then engage with the wider business community. 4. Development will evolve without major unjustified intervention as needs arise. 5. Proactively incentivise Swale jobs (via business rates) to be offered to Swale residents. 6. Continued investment on existing strategic employment sites. (Inc. The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council.) 7. Reduce the number of low employment warehouse units and look at redevelopment of existing sites to create higher density employment with less traffic. (Inc. The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council, Tunstall Parish Council.) 8. Ensure that the M2 J5 improvements are implemented asap. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council.) 9. Developing what is left of the industrialized area will help by making it easier to get permission to develop industry there; manufacturing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider in conjunction with the Employment Land Review. • Will need to be considered when deciding on the settlement strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>is the fundamental way to create wealth - retail just moves it about.</p> <p>10. Building any manufacturing or processing site will always get protesters from the local area but many of the protests are often based on miss-information. The Council have to see through this, make unpopular decisions and sometimes take some flak.</p> <p>11. Employment locations should be as close to new developments to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>12. Swale needs a local technical college and strive to increase the skills and qualification level of the local workforce the area.</p> <p>13. Incentives and tax breaks, donations from philanthropists with connections to the area.</p> <p>14. Not with mass housing developments.</p> <p>15. Put new employment locations closer to road/rail access....what about upgrading Swale Halt?</p> <p>16. These areas need to be pro-actively managed and subject of continued investment to raise productivity. (Quinn Estates Ltd.)</p> <p>17. In order to grow businesses need to be able to attract people to work there and provide attractive places for people to live. (Quinn Estates Ltd.)</p> <p>18. It is disappointing that Question 11 only focuses on strategic employment sites given the valuable contribution that existing smaller employment locations make.</p> <p>19. Put the needs of the population before those of developers who have no stake in the area.</p> <p>20. Businesses should be part of long term planning.</p> <p>21. All existing employment sites should be allocated/safeguarded for employment uses. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>22. Expand employment sites in greater areas of affluence such as at Faversham as the rail link at Faversham is better than the rail link at Newington. (Comment by Newington Parish Council.)</p> <p>23. Swale should be looking at more strategic locations and attract</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>white collar establishments. (Comment by Newington Parish Council.)</p> <p>24. With the increase of local retail parks we need to re-think our High Streets.</p> <p>25. Finish the Northern Link road. (Inc. Quinn Estates Ltd, Trenport Investments Ltd.)</p> <p>26. Build a decent Sheppey Crossing so land on the island can be fully utilised for industry along with a decent road across the island.</p> <p>27. Need to be able to link the West of the town/KSP through the town and as far to Sheerness Docks.</p> <p>28. The Port of Sheerness is a major economic driver within Swale and the wider region. (Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd.)</p> <p>29. Peel has prepared the Sheerness Port Master Plan (November 2014) that sets out the vision for the Port over the next 20 years. This masterplan has ambitious and expansive plans for investment and growth in the Port of Sheerness, which will benefit all within the Swale region. (Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd.)</p> <p>30. The new Local Plan should consider the potential Rushenden Marshes offers for Port and/or housing/mixed use development. (Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd.)</p> <p>31. Eurolink needs an improved road network.</p> <p>32. Kent Science Park is not really a "strategic employment location."</p> <p>33. Ensure that KSP is used for high technology science businesses only. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council.)</p> <p>34. The Science Park needs to have a major educational establishment linked to it to give it any credibility as a 'Science Park'.</p> <p>35. What source of R & D is expected to become involved promote the growth and prestige of the Science Park?</p> <p>36. There is vacant land and some vacant units at Oare Road, which should be strongly marketed.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>37. Shepherd Neame should be encouraged to improve the appearance of their buildings to help with their spin-off tourism business.</p> <p>38. Stronger measures should be taken to keep unnecessary lorry traffic out of Faversham town streets.</p> <p>39. Additional employment could be provided near Brenley Corner.</p> <p>40. Need to improve the road connection to Ashford.</p> <p>41. Further development Sheerness to make it into a viable alternative to Dover post-Brexit.</p> | |
| <p>Q12 The approach to housing numbers: What would the implications be for Swale if it were to adopt either the Government's 'starting point' for housing targets or a higher level of provision?</p> | <p>107</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adverse impacts on health services (and infrastructure in general). 2. Not enough water and loss of aquifer. 3. Increased risk to food security. 4. Adverse impacts on flora and fauna. 5. Greater pollution without increase in bus services. 6. Increased parking and need for more parking spaces in towns. 7. More community facilities needed, but developers will use viability to wriggle out of providing them. 8. Situation is not as bad as is made out. 9. Building more houses to improve economy is spurious as it is about infrastructure. 10. Government target is already too high and does not take into growth that has already occurred. Should not aim for higher and should reduce settling in the SE from outside. Build absolute minimum for Swale needs and build on brownfield sites only. 11. Taking in people because of a better environment will damage the environment they seek. 12. Do nothing as Local Plan is being reviewed too early. Should wait for national picture to emerge. New homes not for people of Swale (Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group). 13. Review only being done to push Quinn estate scheme through, need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress assessment to determine development capacity, although work already undertaken does not currently indicate exceptional circumstances. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>to sort out existing infrastructure needs.</p> <p>14. A disaster for rural communities whose infrastructure could not sustain it.</p> <p>15. Tell the Government it is an impossible demand.</p> <p>16. Creation of slums and loss of identity, amenities and quality of life.</p> <p>17. The housing numbers won't be delivered.</p> <p>18. Government's housing number method should be revisited (Bredgar PC).</p> <p>19. Targets should be a minimum and Council should not use a stepped approach (Hume Consultancy, Redrow Homes).</p> <p>20. A higher target could only be supported if it did not impact upon the AONB (Kent Downs AONB).</p> <p>21. Need to consider Brexit before proceeding (Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>22. Higher targets bring benefits – economic growth, increased delivery, more affordable homes and improved infrastructure and facilities (Peter Court Associates, Esquire Developments).</p> <p>23. Gridlock, pollution, loss of agricultural land, strain on water, utilities and health, natural environment, loss of rural identity, loss of community cohesion (inc. Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group, Tunstall PC).</p> <p>24. Would need step change in delivery and this could not be achieved from existing strategy (Trenport Investments Ltd, Crown Estate, MLN Land and Properties).</p> <p>25. Standardised method is 'starting point'. Higher target is needed to meet London's unmet need (Esquire Developments).</p> <p>26. No exceptional circumstances to provide anything other than the required provision (MLN Land and Properties, Gladman Developments). Concerns about community infrastructure and the environment are not adequate reasons not to adopt the Government's approach (Peel Ports).</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | 27. Higher targets will unlock sites in rural areas (Kember Loudon Williams). 28. Implications depend on how development is distributed. | |
| Q13 Co-operating with other councils to meet development needs: Do you believe that Swale should consider asking its council neighbours to provide for its unmet development needs? If so, what reasons would the Council give, who would it ask and why would they be well placed to help? Likewise, if asked by a neighbouring council to consider meeting their unmet development needs, what should be our | 73 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Swale not well placed to meet unmet needs from neighbours – struggling to address own needs, let alone others – represents the majority view. 2. Swale should ask for assistance – AONB/SSSI, topography, aquifers, agricultural land, no A&E services, coast, designated landscapes and gaps (inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 3. Development should go to the north of England. 4. Would only be used for politician’s pet projects such as J5A. 5. Swale has reasonable choice of own sites/should not look to other Councils to meet need/no evidence given as to why need cannot be met, but should look to take unmet need from elsewhere – minority view (MLN Land and Properties). 6. Need to consider what is meant by ‘unmet need’. 7. Maidstone likely to meet its need so Swale should commit to doing the same (Maidstone BC). 8. Co-operation over integrated transport systems between areas would be useful. 9. Need to provide housing near to mainline stations across all Councils on HS1 line (inc. Tunstall PC). 10. Only Thanet could be asked because it will benefit their economy. 11. Should encourage Govt. to invest in other areas of the country. Council’s should get together to argue for this. 12. Other Councils should not shift their obligations onto Swale. 13. Should ask neighbours once all brownfield land has been identified. 14. How would Swale benefit from taking the development that others did not want? 15. Doing away with planning areas should ensure adequate sites are | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are subject to assessment of development capacity (see Q12). Regardless dialogue with neighbours continues and there will be statements of common ground prepared in due course. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| response and why? | | <p>available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Should be dialogue with London/should not be a London overspill (inc. Newington PC). 17. Should look at how Manchester area is co-operating as good example. 18. Would be prudent to engage with other Council's (Natural England). 19. Could only work where a local authority has a small geographical area. Council should review AONB boundary (Peter court Associates). 20. Loss of aquifers is reason to divert development to other areas (Bredgar PC). 21. Would be surprised if Swale could meet its own target let alone anyone else's. 22. Rely too much on adjacent areas for healthcare so this needs to be addressed. 23. Needs to be fair. 24. Can be met with small developments. 25. Should consider commuting for employment into Swale from certain areas where Swale cannot provide the jobs from own population. 26. Could consider higher quality health and FE provision in Swale to meet wider needs. 27. It will depend on which areas have the strongest case for environmental and/or infrastructure problems. 28. Need can be met if infrastructure led plan is pursued (Esquire Developments). 29. Need can be met if villages are considered (Kember Loudon Williams). 30. Need to consider whether Swale remains a stand-alone HMA or whether a wider Memorandum of Understanding is required (Gladman Developments). 31. Housing will put an end to cultural and community events as well as | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>cultural diversity.</p> <p>32. Don't worry about elsewhere; let's have a plan for Sittingbourne for a change.</p> <p>33. Other Councils have better infrastructure.</p> <p>34. Keep calm and make a sensible plan for the Borough.</p> <p>35. If there is harm to AONB/setting then other Councils should be requested to assist, however, many have the same issues (Kent Downs AONB).</p> | |
| <p>Q14 Departing from the standardised housing number methodology: What compelling circumstances could there be for the Council to take a different approach to the standardised method of arriving at overall housing numbers?</p> | <p>62</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Govt. need to rethink whole approach/Govt. needs to be challenged. 2. Do not understand what methodology is. 3. Saturation with housing and loss of countryside, agricultural land, wildlife, AONB, ancient woodland, and stress on health facilities (most frequently highlighted), water, aquifers, sewerage, pollution, traffic chaos. Land subject to flooding (inc. Tunstall PC, Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 4. Should provide for local need first, followed by migration (if we have to) and then the need to provide local employment and transport. 5. Start with what the town needs, not what Govt. wants. 6. No circumstances (Crown Estate, MLN Land and Properties, Redrow, Esquire – minority resident's view). 7. Start out with the standard methodology and then review it (Peter Court Associates). 8. Brexit means that it should be reviewed (inc. Newington PC). Developments, Gladman Developments). 9. Meeting affordable housing and providing for flagship projects may be reason to depart from standard methodology (Hume Planning Consultancy). 10. Geographical and geological constraints – coast and Island with limited transport provision. M2 reduces opportunities to the south. The result is an unrealistic reliance on agricultural land which the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress preparation of Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to determine approach, but at this point it should be assumed that 1,086 dpa will be the starting point. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>country as a whole should be protecting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Stop blaming the Government; it is greedy farmers, developers and Councillors. 12. The need to provide more affordable housing, remove the incentivise profits instead of meeting needs and the ability of developers to sit on land. | |
| <p>Q15 Increasing housing delivery: How can the Council speed up the delivery of new homes in Swale?</p> | <p>76</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take more control of process. 2. Keep brownfield land register up to date (inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham, Tunstall and Bredgar PCs). 3. Use time bounded consents to prevent land-banking (most popular comment, inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham, Tunstall and Bredgar PCs). 4. Use empty properties first, use more brownfield and unused land. 5. Work pro-actively with developers through early engagement (Anderson Group). 6. Encourage smaller developments in each village/smaller more widespread developments. 7. Split development sites to increase number of developers. 8. Don't speed up delivery – creates suspicion as to motives. 9. Use social housing and not for profit organisations to facilitate affordable housing. 10. Create jobs first rather than 'build and then they will come'. 11. Invest in infrastructure projects. 12. Include windfalls in five year supply. 13. New communities will not be able to deliver enough, should plan for a mix of sites in different locations (The Crown Estate, 14. Encourage modular construction (inc. Newington PC). 15. Build smaller developers in wider locations and in places where people want to live. 16. Improve the efficiency of the planning department. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the actions listed are outside of the Council's remit and are or have been considered by Government. • The NPPF will expect Councils to adopt measures such as ensuring a proportion of allocated smaller sites. • Determining the settlement strategy will also have a bearing on delivery rates, i.e. the use of more viable areas and/or the role of new settlements or large allocations which could have multiple outlets. Likewise infrastructure led schemes may speed up delivery. • Depending upon the settlement strategy, the use of a stepped approach to delivery (and for calculating the land supply) may need to be explored. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17. Release land where there is market demand and do not frustrate development with unrealistic requirements (Peter Court Associates). 18. Large strategic scale sites that creates major investment. Smaller schemes cannot do this. Large schemes can include mix of delivery methods (Quinn Estates Ltd). 19. Assess more thoroughly the deliverability of allocated sites by using a SHLAA working group (MLN Land and Properties). 20. Review DM procedures – Member training, more delegation, improve report accuracy, review appeal decisions (MLN Land and Properties). 21. Improve pre-app. Experience at SBC poor –delays, changing of staff and conflicting and incomplete advice (MLN Land and Properties). 22. Need more evidence if a larger windfall allowance is to be made (MLN Land and Properties). Does not think it appropriate. 23. Establish infrastructure committee using General Powers of Competence to stop bullying powers of developers and keeps development within strategic planning (MLN Land and Properties). 24. Direct housing to higher value areas (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.). 25. Force areas to take development. 26. Strategy will require greenfield and brownfield sites and small sites as well larger ones/focus on smaller schemes to supplement larger ones (inc. Redrow, W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd., Esquire Developments, Kember Loudon Williams, Gladman Developments). 27. Speed up S106 process (Trenport Investment Ltd.). 28. Stop relying on Quinn Estates to run future strategies. 29. Evidence shows that early delivery of schools can speed up housing completions (Education and Skills Finding Agency). 30. Council should use prudential borrowing to build its own houses. Would provide local employment, allow control of development plans, provide affordable housing and avoid profiteering. There is more land on Sheppey that could benefit from housing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consider the establishment of a SHLAA working group to more closely examine delivery. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | 31. You can't increase housebuilding without undermining existing residents/Council must prove demand. 32. More pro-active discussion with developers. 33. Increase choice of locations. 34. Reduce not speed up – appeal to Europe! 35. Incentivise people to walk. 36. | |
| Q16 Affordable housing: How can the Council increase the amount of affordable housing that is currently built? | 75 | 1. Close viability loophole, stick to percentages with no appeals, enforce quota (inc. Newington PC). 2. Provide more rented accommodation and make sure it cannot be sold on (majority comment), more Council and housing association properties (inc. Tunstall and Bredgar PCs). 3. Do joint ventures with Network Rail to provide homes close to stations to incentivise sustainable location and travel. 4. Enforce allocations on new developments. 5. Focus on what is needed, not 4/5 bed houses, force developers to build what is needed (inc. Tunstall and Bredgar PCs). 6. Council should use own capital to invest. 7. Use Community Land Trusts, exception sites. 8. Local residents to form groups to buy plots of land and 'group build' them. 9. More smaller properties within town centre and to include houses above shops (inc. Tunstall and Bredgar PCs). 10. Set housing target to support more affordable homes (inc. Peter Court Associates, Kember Loudon Williams, Gladman Developments, 11. Current definition of affordable housing is not affordable. Social housing is the genuine provision. 12. Developers are the problem. 13. Developers should set aside land for low cost self builds. 14. Get more Neighbourhood Plans started. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine affordable housing need via Strategic Housing Market Assessment. • Explore more pro-active policy position for Community Land Trusts, exceptions sites and self builds, inc. the role of large sites in encouraging these. • Explore lower affordable housing threshold for rural areas (cross over between SHMA and viability evidence). |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Build more Rent to Buy and undertake new SHMA to understand how new tenures will contribute to meeting housing need (methodology for approach included) (RentPlus UK). 16. Build more in viable areas where affordable housing can be provided (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.). 17. Buy up empty homes and commercial premises, use more brownfield sites, town centre locations. 18. Affordable rented units by the private sector should not be included. They should be provided by institutions, the Council and housing associations. No affordable units for sale and there should be a higher proportion of affordable units at higher densities in central urban areas (inc. Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group). 19. Will never be enough as successive Governments have not been up to the task. 20. If people want affordable housing, they should move elsewhere. 21. Greenfield sites able to contribute more affordable housing than brownfield (Gladman Developments). 22. Spread housing more evenly around Borough. 23. Would support affordable housing to sustain AONB communities and would support lower threshold for sites within the AONB e.g. 5 units or less (Kent Downs AONB). | |
| <p>Q17 Meeting the future needs for Gypsies and Travellers: What approach should we be considering to making further site provision for Gypsies and</p> | <p>58</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In line with Government policy, but nothing more. 2. There are already adequate sites which need policing and enforcing (majority view). 3. Tax payers will not want you to make any provision. 4. Talk to existing site residents about whether it can be extended or whether it is fit for purpose. 5. Improve enforcement on illegal incursions. Needs to be criminal offence. 6. No further provision needed in Upchurch. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise new GTAA and policy position in respect of policy and cultural needs. • Progress a call for sites if required. • Depending on need for site allocations, consider approach for making provision on large |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Travellers? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Require new developments to make provision for one pitch for every 50 dwellings. Needs further consultation with both Travellers and settled communities. 8. A detailed report is required. 9. Sites should be controlled to ensure only those who live there are eligible. 10. Critically review current sites. 11. Consider sites with the least environmental impact (Natural England). 12. Ensure GT definition is met in all cases (inc. Newington PC). 13. Better enforcement to maintain the credibility of existing register of sites (Bredgar PC). 14. Use existing LP policy (Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 15. Swale should commit to meet its GT needs within its own administrative boundaries and engage with MBC (Maidstone BC). 16. If they pay no taxes or abide by same rules as rest of society then no consideration should be given. 17. Should be built in remote location so that GTs can maintain their own communities. 18. Needs assessment should be fair and should engage with Travelling Community, including those who fall outside of definition. You should allocate sites and provide a fair criterion based policy (National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups). 19. AONB must be given highest priority for protection. 20. Let other Boroughs increase their provision. 21. Make fair balance of the rights of the Travelling Community and those of the settled community. 22. Decline of fruit picking begs the question as to whether further provision is required. 23. Site assessment should be based on suitability and sites with temporary permission should not be taken as influencing a site's allocation. Sites within the AONB need to be of the highest quality | mainstream housing sites. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| <p>Q18 Mix of dwellings: What mix of new houses should we be trying to build in the future and how can we ensure that the housing market provides for all housing needs?</p> | <p>69</p> | <p>(Kent Downs AONB).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per Europe, provide more long term rented, with high standards of maintenance (inc. Tunstall PC). 2. For older people (inc. Tunstall Parish Council, Newington PC). 3. Small first time homes and also family houses. 4. Houses for more people working from home. 5. To accord with market signals and need. There should be flexibility to ensure that development is not restricted. For e.g., small flats may be a need, but may not always be appropriate. Council should not be prescriptive (Anderson Group). 6. Less 4/5 bed houses – force developers to stop this. 7. Less aimed at people from London, large houses encourage this. 8. Housing market will never meet all housing needs as population is growing too fast. 9. Via Community Land Trust 10. High density housing on brownfield land. 11. Affordable housing. 12. Small estates with mixed houses so good for community. 13. Housing to attract down sizers, but sheltered housing is degrading. 14. Council should build own social rented housing/should be more affordable rented (inc. Newington and Rodmersham PCs, Five Parishes Group). 15. Need for life time homes (and use of Lifetime Homes Standard). 16. Entry level housing. 17. Housing to keep people independent disabled access. 18. Modula homes (inc. Newington PC). 19. More bungalows (with restriction to prevent extensions in the roof space) to free up housing stock. 20. 5/6 bed executive housing (minority view), targeted in areas to rebalance housing stock. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress preparation of Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to determine housing mix and type. • Consider viability implications of housing mix. • Explore more pro-active policy position for Community Land Trusts, exceptions sites and self builds, inc. the role of large sites in encouraging these. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Guided by past completion rates to see if need is being met. 22. Developments with wider roads and more parking. 23. More community based living for single people. 24. Should be a market led approach, not prescriptive (OSG Architecture Ltd, Peter Court Associates, Hume Planning Consultancy, Trenport Investment Ltd., minority residents view). 25. Don't let developers hide behind viability assessments. 26. Urban sites likely to generate smaller units, whilst urban extensions and rural sites will generate family housing. Promoting larger family homes will help draw in high achievers who then invest – as used by Thanet and Ashford (Redrow). 27. Cannot be solved at local level – a national infrastructure strategy is required. 28. Need gardens. 29. In old farm buildings. 30. Depends on evidence. 31. Houses close to urban areas with easy access. 32. Smaller homes in villages. 33. Discourage extensions to existing homes. 34. Not high rise apartments. | |
| <p>Q19 Self and custom build: How best should the local plan make provision that will enable people to build their own homes?</p> | <p>58</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put designated self-build plots on development sites (inc. Tunstall and Rodmersham PCs, Five Parishes Group). 2. Parish Councils/villages should determine where self builds should go. 3. Allocate sites in rural locations. 4. Should have same constraints as all sites. 5. On brownfield land. 6. Numbers should be kept low. 7. Give support to self-builders by facilitating contact between them and guiding them through planning process. 8. Requirements for self-build plots should not delay overall housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress preparation of Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to determine level and approach toward self and custom build. • Explore more pro-active policy position for self builds, including the role of large sites in encouraging these. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>delivery.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Should be encouraged by giving Council Tax 'holiday'. 10. Could use companies who can put up homes very quickly. 11. Custom build opportunities are low in Swale and must be addressed. Such building is bespoke and offers better standards than housing estate models. Potton Homes should be contacted so that discussions on how custom build can be advanced in Swale. 12. Is this a big enough sector even worth considering?/not aware of this being a problem/stick to issue of building more affordable homes. 13. Please consider a Community Land Trust for Faversham. 14. Should require a percentage of custom build plots. 15. Should have another call for sites specifically on this issue (Peter Court Associates). 16. Make large areas of land available for them. 17. Only where land is allocated to prevent speculative development (Newington PC). 18. If allowed they should provide alternative energy features. 19. Where someone can demonstrate commitment to the local community. 20. Only within new communities. 21. Should not be quota led (Gladman Developments). 22. Make sure they are not executive homes. 23. Will not help in quest for numbers, but do not be deceived by developers who may use this argument. 24. Getting planning permission should be faster. | |
| <p>Q20 Optional housing technical standards: What evidence is there that Swale should</p> | <p>52</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should make housing which are better designed internally and externally with more parking (majority point) and waste areas, include means to conserve water and energy (inc. Bredgar PC, Newington PC). 2. Where are the resources to do it? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members to determine whether optional water and space standards should be pursued. If so, evidence base (including impacts on viability) to be |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| set additional housing technical standards in the next local plan? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Be balanced to ensure town is attractive as surrounding areas. 4. Learn lessons from past from existing Swale estates – appalling parking layouts and problems, access and waste collection etc. Use Building for Life and real life parking standards. More green standards (majority view) (inc. Rodmersham and Tunstall PCs, Five Parishes Group). 5. Need standards to ensure eco-friendly development, retention of trees, new hedges, meadows and wildlife corridors (Bredgar PC). 6. More accessibility and independent living. 7. Existing LP did not bring forward standards so evidence will be needed to show impacts. Swale is one of the weaker housing markets so minimum space standards could counter delivery of housing (Esquire Developments, W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd.). 8. Questions whether there is need as customer satisfaction surveys would indicate that size is not an issue in Swale (W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd.). 9. Without them developers will engage in race to the bottom i.e. Grenfell. 10. Should cover those things that set the development apart in the first place with legal covenants enforced. 11. Water standards needed because of importance of aquifers. Inadequate information often on planning applications. 12. New buildings should be built to last for generation to come. 13. Landscaping standards are really important. 14. Build parking beneath homes as in France. | gathered. |
| Q21 Making effective use of land: How can more effective use of brownfield land | 69 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep register up to date and accurate and enforce it (inc. Tunstall, Rodmersham and Bredgar, PCs, Five Parishes Group). 2. Encourage high density (inc. Tunstall PC). 3. Build above shops and leisure amenities. (inc. Tunstall PC). 4. Work with developers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress brownfield sites for allocation via SHLAA and in accordance with Government policy. • Brownfield land register to be |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| be achieved? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Encourage development on any site with a previous use, even if it is not PDL (Anderson Group). 6. Exhaust brownfield land before using any high quality agricultural land/build on brownfield before green. Should be a presumption in favour of brownfield land. 7. Tidy up peripheral sites. 8. Consider sites across the whole of the Borough. Should be considered regardless of sustainability. 9. Force developers to build on brownfield, they do not like building on them because profits are less. 10. Convert empty office blocks/warehousing/space conversion into affordable housing for singles/couples. 11. Identify missed opportunities e.g. Norton Ash Garden Centre. 12. Use carrot and stick incentives inc. CPO/LDO. 13. Build on under-used car parks. 14. Biodiversity value of brownfield sites should be fully considered to ensure sites with least environmental impact are progressed (Natural England). 15. We have massive chalk pits which could be regenerated. 16. Brownfield land should only stand for one year without an application being submitted. 17. Brownfield land requires assessment of heritage (Historic England). 18. Although supportive, will not be sufficient to meet needs in isolation (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd, Redrow, Kember Loudon Williams). 19. Prevent land-banking. 20. Less land for retail outlets should be used, move waste site to Ridham, use land better in town centres. 21. Brownfield register has deliberately been kept short to push the need for major greenfield development. Should include all brownfield land and consider use of such land for employment as well (Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). | updated at end of 2018. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | 22. Eurolink land could be used for housing. 23. Can see vast areas around Swale that could be redeveloped. 24. Give developers a tax break. 25. Not all brownfield sites within the AONB will be suitable e.g. where they fail to relate to existing settlements or would not be appropriate to particular locality or character. Brownfield sites would normally be better suited to employment or community based uses (Kent Downs AONB). | |
| Q22 Density: Should the next local plan set minimum density standards? If so, what standards should we be considering? | 63 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should set variable standards – urban high, rural low (inc. Tunstall, Rodmersham PCs and Five Parishes Group). 2. Denser developments can create more car parking problems (majority view) and residents are more likely to annoy each other through noise. People will be crammed like sardines. 3. Higher density could create more vehicles and strain on infrastructure. 4. Use population figures and adopt a percentage standard e.g. 2%. 5. Address density as part of wider design code. 6. Should set minimum standards with greater use of terraces and reduce space for roads. 7. Not high rise for Faversham. 8. Should be design led rather than by a specific standard. 9. Each case on its own merits/carry on current approach (inc. MLN Land and Properties Ltd., Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.). 10. Exception should be given to custom build. 11. Build no more houses in Swale, no area should have to take 5K or 11K homes. 12. Cars must be kept off the roads, people should have no more than 1 car per bedroom. 13. Should be no standard (OSG Architecture). 14. Question is ambiguous. 15. Less space needed for low cost affordable homes for young and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members to resolve whether to consider setting density thresholds. If so, evidence base to be determined in support. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>elderly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Need green standards as well. 17. Use minimum and maximum standards as appropriate. 18. Undertake consultation with communities to see what works. 19. Houses already too close with no gardens. 20. Use minimum standards, use three storey buildings and more terraces, but no high rise and better standards of parking (Newington PC). 21. Minimum standards needed to ensure developers don't prioritise high return housing. Policies need to be applied sensitively with regard to location, e.g. Bredgar could have some infill on road frontages, but not back filling (inc. Bredgar PC). 22. Sites with sea views could have high density. 23. High standards should have green standards. 24. Inventive design would be needed to make such housing attractive. 25. Minimum standards might be appropriate at transport hubs or on brownfield site, but should not be used elsewhere – should be context led as standards would affect viability and deliverability (Gladman Developments). 26. Gardens already too small with no opportunity for caravan or additional car. 27. Use standards advocated by Duchy of Cornwall. 28. Most developers will be happy to increase densities as it will mean higher profits. 29. High density homes for the elderly population who are staying in their homes till death which is not the most practical use of housing stock. 30. In the AONB it is unlikely that higher densities would be reflective of AONB qualities (Kent Downs AONB). | |
| Q23 Social and physical | 70 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In totality, the full range of social and physical infrastructure is highlighted as priorities. However, health (hospital, GP and dentists, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue dialogue with infrastructure providers with |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p>infrastructure: What do you consider the broad social and physical infrastructure priorities should be for Swale in the coming years?</p> | | <p>but also other facilities with health related benefits – i.e. sport and open space, reducing pollution), education, transport and sport/open space are notable in the level of responses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Site specific provision includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sittingbourne station parking. b. Northern Relief Road. c. J5/A249 improvements. d. Extra motorway junction south of Sittingbourne. e. No link road between A2 and M2 – not needed and M2 is overloaded. f. M2 widening. g. 20mph limit in Faversham. h. A2 from Western Link to Brenley Corner to become a street. i. A Swale general hospital/new hospital at Brenley Corner. j. Memorial Hospital too small. k. Leisure facilities should be subject to consultation to assess what people want. l. Protect AONB to maximise its benefits to the Borough. m. Invest in Sittingbourne High Street, rents too high, need decent shops to attract shoppers back from other towns. n. A Swale incinerator to reduce journeys to dispose waste. 3. Needs to be provided before housing is approved and enforced if not provided. Infrastructure already under stress. Current system is flawed. Other means to fund infrastructure is also required. 4. No further development should be approved until issues are sorted out. 5. Jobs required supported by transport and green infrastructure to attract employers to Swale. 6. Need environment that supports larger population of older people. 7. Improve village interconnection to improve social mobility. 8. Multi-functional green infrastructure to be a part of all allocations | <p>Infrastructure Delivery Schedule prepared in due course.</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>(Natural England/Kent Downs AONB).</p> <p>9. No rainwater should be allowed to enter the sewerage system on new developments to reduce burden on water treatment plants and help retain water reserves.</p> <p>10. Development should meet Guiding Principles (Southern Water).</p> <p>11. Linking green infrastructure with wider infrastructure needs is causing neglect of former. GIF identified funding gap of £39M for GI across Kent. Needs to be addressed with investment at strategic level – enhance existing green spaces and create new areas, reduce impacts of new development and provide alternative green space, specifically, AONB impacted by increased footfall and increase use of rural infrastructure (Kent Downs AONB).</p> | |
| <p>Q24 Capturing land values for social and physical infrastructure: What more can be done by the Council to ensure that the infrastructure needs generated by new development are matched by a developer's financial contributions? Should more</p> | <p>62</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large developments should not be considered unless they undertake all infrastructure/infrastructure should be up front (majority view) (inc. Bredgar Parish Council). 2. Strict regulations and enforcement should be imposed and financial penalties used. 3. If developer fails to comply, they should not be considered for future applications. 4. Scandinavian countries have interesting, community focused solutions. 5. Contributions should be higher for greenfield. 6. Government should be pressed for contribution as developer contributions are not enough. 7. Contributions need to be sufficient to deliver the additional school places. ESFA would be interested in the progression of any CIL. If large residential developments are to be pursued, then emerging ESFA proposals for forward funding of schools may be relevant and would be happy to meet to discuss this opportunity further (Education and Skills Finding Agency). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach likely to be a mix and, in some cases, bespoke, but will be dependent upon the settlement strategy and the range of sites allocated. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| radical approaches toward 'land value capture' be considered? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Infrastructure should be in place before development. 9. Should introduce CIL to cover all costs and monies should be in a bond at the planning application stage (inc. Newington and Tunstall PCs). 10. Too big brother and will not work. You need to incentivise and work with developers. 11. Persimmon CEO bonus does not tally with land viability complaints. No land banking. 12. Committees of non-political members of the public should be formed to ensure money is spent for the good of the community. 13. Make sure we are on a par or better than neighbouring Councils. 14. SBC should use the money for what it is intended and not divert it off elsewhere. 15. Highest levy on greenfield land with value of environmental/amenity quality set. 16. Should have standard nationwide charge based on Council Tax band as one off payment. 17. Develop best practice model to use as brief. 18. Answers to this question will be from people bias toward developers. 19. Current system gives developers too many loop-holes. 20. Developers need to show social responsibility/stewardship. 21. What if the landowner is also the developer? 22. Developers also need to fund additional staff in public services. 23. If developers are made responsible for the infrastructure to last a lifetime for the site then they will build something that lasts. 24. Yes more radical approaches to land value capture must be considered. 25. Lack of AMR means that it is difficult to ascertain what developer contributions have been collected and how they have been spent. Highlights High Court case that affordable housing cannot be bypassed by using viability assessments. For large schemes, | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>requiring significant infrastructure, these should not lie in the hands of the private sector, but fully accountable to local people. Council also does not have expertise to examine viability assessments. Have seen many developments where infrastructure is promised and reneged upon. There is now a huge backlash from residents on these failings (inc. Rodmersham PC, Five Parishes Group).</p> <p>26. Land value capture will only work on developments of a certain scale, but is an untested and complex approach. Would deter investment as developers like more traditional approaches and would go elsewhere. Site specific policy on infrastructure could be used, ensuring that the cost of the infrastructure is factored into the overall land value. Early engagement on such projects is essential to avoid delivery risks. Highlights model used by Quinn Estates at Highsted Park (Quinn Estates).</p> <p>27. Farmers should not be allowed to sell for housebuilding – we need farming for the welfare of society.</p> <p>28. Locate growth to high value areas (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.).</p> <p>29. CPO is ultimately land value capture.</p> <p>30. A matter for national government, not the local plan (Redrow).</p> <p>31. Merit in master developer and plot passport approach. Consider use of Development Corporation to consider infrastructure across a number of large sites. However there are issues about speed of delivery on larger sites. For smaller sites, the usual rules should apply.</p> <p>32. Current system is imperfect and even if LVC is used, the value of the land in the first place will be part of it (and therefore the fact that some areas will generate more than others). In schemes of circa 150 dwellings contributions between £1-£2.5 can often be secured. However, value of contributions is undervalued and local communities are not presented with the full contribution. LVC is not without its problems – highlights North Essex Garden Communities where the</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>peak levels of debt could make overall delivery a significant challenge. Unless landowners are given an incentive to sell, they may wait. In these cases CPO is the only option. Council should therefore use CIL/S106 (Gladman Developments).</p> | |
| <p>Q25 A Swale Community Infrastructure Levy? Should Swale introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy on the development of greenfield sites to housing across Swale?</p> | <p>64</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low CIL for brownfield land and high for high quality agricultural/greenfield land (majority view). 2. An independent management company should be formed to control projects funded by CIL. Should comprise political parties and the public. 3. CIL will ruin the countryside because it makes the process easier. 4. Yes as S106 can be side stepped by developers. 5. No, but fines should be applied if infrastructure not carried out. 6. CIL charge should be so high as to discourage all housebuilding, thereby frustrating Government attempts to force the Borough to destroy the character of the area. 7. What will CIL achieve? It will be politically hijacked as per Southern Relief Road (Five Parishes Group). 8. Yes if it means we have control over the projects that will be funded. 9. Should take into account Government review on such matters. However, CIL is a blunt tool with no requirement for it to be spent on specific infrastructure. Payments in kind are also complex. Tariff-based approach not appropriate for larger developments. Can deliver the infrastructure without the changes indicated and scheme should therefore be excluded (Quinn Estates). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A decision on whether or not to pursue a CIL Charging schedule will need to be made on the basis of viability evidence and what would best support delivery of the chosen development strategy. |
| <p>Q26 Mitigating impacts of climate change: How can planning policies positively influence climate</p> | <p>58</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledgement of pollution/climate change and impacts on health, species and habitats. New housing will be detrimental. 2. Learn about low 'maintenance' houses from abroad. 3. All new houses to have solar power and general encouragement for renewables eg wind farms, wave power and community energy, water efficiency measures, grey water systems, sustainable planting, green | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will need to consider need for further evidence and policy review light of revised NPPF policy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| change outcomes or mitigate their impacts? | | <p>space provision, eco-friendly building products, sustainable transport and good accessibility to services (including Newington Parish Council and Tunstall Parish Council).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Adopt and enforce innovative technical standards on build quality (renovations and new build) including for geo-thermal heating, permeable road, drives, car parks. 5. Develop standards with neighbouring boroughs. 6. Promote design quality. 7. Improve infrastructure. 8. Allow/require solar panel arrays and small scale wind turbines and water efficiency measures. 9. Green energy is one of Swale's most valuable assets, particularly in combination with electrical grid infrastructure and Swale has a duty to ensure they make the most of this valuable resource at a NSIP scale. Planning policy can positively influence development to address climate change (Arcus Consultancy Ltd of behalf of Cleve Hill Solar Park Ltd). 10. Penalise developers for poor workmanship. 11. Design and promote greener development including insulation/energy efficiency, solar PV and thermal, ground source heat pumps, sustainable drainage coupled with vegetation (particularly important during more intense weather events), grey water systems, eco building products. 12. Financial incentives eg council tax reductions for eco homes. 13. Protect agricultural land for food production, land drainage and to mitigate for climate change. 14. Encourage farmers not to sell land for development. 15. Avoid developing greenfield sites as can lead to flooding. Only develop brownfield sites. Avoid building on floodplains. 16. Protect and promote countryside and open/green spaces (including green roofs, hedges and trees) to mitigate pollution, urban heat gain, | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>climate change, pollination.</p> <p>17. Plant more trees for amenity value, to improve air quality, provide shading, cool urban areas and mitigate noise pollution. Swale poor at this. Protect hedgerows and wildlife and orchards – wildlife corridors (including Tunstall Parish Council).</p> <p>18. Keep things local to reduce private transport needs. Provide good public transport and cycle and walking routes (including rural) and bring health benefits. Smart technology to improve transport network. Emphasise access to HS1, build near rail stations and promote eco travel (including Tunstall Parish Council).</p> <p>19. Reduce speed limits to 20mph in residential areas to make cycling /walking safer, make it less easy for driving and reduce emissions.</p> <p>20. Reduce congestion through improving road network so engines aren't idling. Enforce this.</p> <p>21. Swale need to assess impact of move to electric vehicles and prepare for this . Require EV charging points in all major car parks.</p> <p>22. Tarmac/tiles reflect sun's heat and contribute to warming. Promote solar energy recovery. (?)</p> <p>23. Planning department already has policies in place to avoid development in floodplain and cut down trees.</p> <p>24. Avoid land subject to flooding such as Iwade, Wises Lane and Pond Farm Road and don't concrete over Garden of England.</p> <p>25. Council ignore impacts of climate change as evidenced by flooding in Teynham.</p> <p>26. Planning decisions should reference advice from CPRE, KWT, conservation trusts.</p> <p>27. Allow shale gas extraction as will reduce CO2 emissions.</p> <p>28. Increase capacity of sewage and drains and lower roads relative to properties to reduce risk of flooding.</p> <p>29. Conservation of historic buildings is an inherent sustainability activity (Historic England).</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>30. Use existing buildings rather than new build as more sustainable. Adapt existing building to be more eco.</p> <p>31. Be mindful of growing demand for water. Don't build in areas of water stress, such as Swale.</p> <p>32. Unsure/no opinion.</p> <p>33. Sceptical that planning can have an influence on climate change.</p> <p>34. Control population and carbon footprint of existing residents before new development.</p> <p>35. Plan for worst climate change scenarios.</p> <p>36. Provision for waste collection and recycling needs to be improved.</p> <p>37. Don't build developments which require new roads as will increase pollution.</p> <p>38. Difficult to influence climate change, but keep trying.</p> <p>39. Consider issue of food miles – Kent has historically provided food for London.</p> <p>40. Mitigation for environmental damage is not possible. However, possible options include: stop developing on greenfield sites; renewables /community power; 'green' construction; water recycling/efficiency; tree planting and green space provision and high quality landscaping; accessibility to public transport including rail; improve existing road infrastructure (eg smart measures) and avoid building new roads which move existing problems elsewhere (inc Five Parishes Group & Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>41. Proper use of fuel facilities (?).</p> <p>42. Minimise economic impacts (Hume Planning Consultancy).</p> <p>43. Effects of climate change including coastal squeeze must be fully integrated into plan's policies and site allocation. Ecological networks (with neighbouring authorities) key to climate change adaptation. Landscaping important for urban cooling (Natural England).</p> <p>44. Planning policies must protect AONB and countryside, high quality agricultural land. New development eco-design, self-sufficient in</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>power, water recycling and efficient. Emphasis on tree, hedge, woodland planting including urban areas. Affordable, efficient and accessible public transport – consider subsidies. Don't build new roads or links to M2 as generates more traffic (inc by Bredgar Parish Council).</p> <p>45. Utilise existing rivers as water features.</p> | |
| <p>Q27 Green energy: What opportunities do you see in green energy for Swale and how should our planning policies seek to encourage or manage them?</p> | <p>55</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage recycling. Refuse (waste to energy) can provide energy/heat and reduce landfill. 2. Green energy eg solar panels should be compulsory and enforced. Incentivise green energy particularly in industrial areas (wind, solar) and residential areas (eg reduced council tax). 3. Make solar panels, EV charging, underground heat sources a requirement (Tunstall Parish Council). 4. Solar farms instead of housing, in appropriate locations. 5. Solar farms can blight landscape. 6. Wind farms to east of Isle of Sheppey and offshore. Encourage wind turbines more generally (relax restrictions) as well as in rural communities to reduce electricity bills. Visual impact should be mitigated. 7. Encourage battery storage including from nuclear and wind. 8. Maximise opportunities for renewables. 9. Hydropower in Faversham and Milton creeks. 10. Standard requirements for new development: solar panels, electric charging points, underground heat sources to enable self-sufficiency. 11. More planning officers. 12. Green energy too expensive when cost passed to residents. 13. Swale are doing well, carry on and encourage green energy. 14. No development should impact environment. 15. No fracking (if environmental impact). 16. Allow shale gas and nuclear. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policies in the adopted local plan will be reviewed and updated in light of the revised NPPF to ensure they provide a positive strategy for renewable energy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>17. Should be strategically planned.</p> <p>18. Cleve Hill Solar Park is greatest opportunity for green energy in Swale (350MW – energy for 110 homes) Development Consent Order determined by Secretary of State before adoption of 2022 Local Plan. Consider a site allocation. Consider updating planning policy to assist with preparation of Local Impact Report and assist other sustainable energy projects in Swale (Cleve Hill Solar Park Limited).</p> <p>19. Swale suitable for decentralized renewable energy. Energy from waste and battery storage also opportunity and important eg alongside solar farm and other forms of development. Both should be supported by policy which differentiates between permanent and temporary uses. Reference KCC’s Energy Opportunities Map. Commitment to exploring such proposals on land at Faversham (WT Lamb Holdings Ltd).</p> <p>20. Swale has multiple opportunities for green energy.</p> <p>21. Clairfy what is ‘new and different infrastructure’ in our communities and landsapes?</p> <p>22. Consider green polices for existing development, before future development.</p> <p>23. Swale House/Borough Council should lead by example.</p> <p>24. New planting and landscaping.</p> <p>25. Local grants for householder green energy.</p> <p>26. Renewable energy schemes need to benefit local communities</p> <p>27. Each property generate own power also community power schemes (Five Parishes Group).</p> <p>28. Mitigation is a farce (Five Parishes Group).</p> <p>29. Policy should support green energy (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd).</p> <p>30. Positive design.</p> <p>31. Supports renewables where no unacceptable environmental impacts</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>(Natural England).</p> <p>32. All future properties should have green energy designed into them to make them net contributors to power network (inc. Bredgar Parish Council).</p> <p>33. Wind turbines should look like windmills.</p> <p>34. Solar farms make managing electrical network difficult.</p> <p>35. Generation glass should be prerequisite.</p> <p>36. Large car parks should incorporate solar panels.</p> <p>37. Air quality a concern (Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>38. Repetitive question (Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>39. Any renewable energy development of significant size in AONB would only be acceptable in exceptional circumstances and in public interest. Local Plan should refer to opportunities to use wood fuel as renewable energy with other benefits in employment, woodland management, landscape and biodiversity. Reference AONB's Position Statement on Renewable Energy again in the next Local Plan (Kent Downs AONB).</p> <p>40. Central government has a role to play.</p> <p>41. Air quality will get worse unless investment in public transport eg monorail.</p> <p>42. Council should identify areas where renewables are suitable and be consistent in decision making.</p> | |
| <p>Q28 Improving the capacity and environment of the A2 corridor: What solutions should we be considering for improving the A2</p> | <p>75</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New system at M2/J5 Stockbury to include underpass/ flyover to Maidstone and direct link from A249 to M2. 2. Implement M2/J5 improvements as soon as possible to stop build up of traffic on A249 as could make big difference. (Residents and Bredgar Parish Council) 3. Upgrade M2/J5 and A249 improvements (Tunstall Parish Council; Bapchild Parish Council; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M2/J5 is already funded by Highways England and a preferred route announced and construction to commence as part of RIS 1. • A249 junction improvements; and A2500 Lower Road improvements are the subject of Housing |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| corridor? | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Improve M2/J5 and J7 and widen the M2 to three lanes where required to encourage more traffic to use that route. 5. Additional junctions on M2. 6. Consider a new bridge link from eastern end of Sheppey. 7. Better flow management on Key Street roundabout needed to stop blocking exit. 8. Build on brownfield sites first to avoid roads destroying communities as in the Whiteway, Cromwell Rd case. 9. None - building more roads will generate more traffic and congestion. Roads cannot cope currently. 10. Restrict development in the area. 11. Cumulative impact of development over recent past has exacerbated problems on A2. Essential that no more is allocated in the corridor. 12. If more roads have to be built make developers responsible for long term maintenance and repair. 13. Not much can be done on A2 – some widening and dual carriageways, perhaps 3 lanes in places. At capacity now. Improvement would mean unacceptable loss of homes. 14. Improvements elsewhere unlikely to relieve the Key St – Gillingham stretch of the A2 corridor. 15. Does not consider a new A2/M2 link road will solve problem, but will add to congestion if it has to be funded by further development on top of Wises lane proposal. 16. Against A2/ M2 link and road improvements being paid for by new housing as 10,000 houses means 30,000 more cars. 17. Provision of A2/M2 link by developers holds the area to ransom of developers and road is unlikely to be provided in time. 18. Increased development plus A2/M2 link will bring this part of Kent to standstill and worsen accident and fatality figures. 19. Development to SE of Sittingbourne would double size of town and create more problems than would solve (for traffic, biodiversity and | <p>Investment Fund Bids and will be supplemented by developer funding from land allocations in the Bearing Fruits Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic transport modelling is in hand (jointly undertaken with Kent County Council Highways to inform choices on reasonable alternative development strategies and options for the local plan review. • Further more detailed modelling will be required to support whatever strategy is chosen for local plan. This will also be used to inform a local transport strategy prepared in cooperation with Kent County Council Highways and transport operators; as to a range of measures to support new development from reducing the need to travel; to means to encourage more walking and cycling; to improving public transport; and potentially for any future public funding bids to support such initiatives. • Joint working with KCCH and Sustrans imminent on a cycling |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>prime agricultural land) – A2/M2 link a sprat to catch a mackerel.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20. A2/ M2 link will have immense impact on the village (not specified which one). 21. A2/M2 Link would attract more traffic toward Sittingbourne from the east and exacerbate the situation (residents; Bredgar Parish Council; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). 22. Highways have stated A2/M2 link is not viable, sensible or required. 23. Complete Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road and see what this achieves first before further development added at Sittingbourne. 24. Resolve the SNRR route – prefer east of Bapchild , near cricket pitch, which would facilitate the A2/M2 link if that is put forward (Bapchild Parish Council). 25. Settle SNRR alignment as soon as possible (and seek funding for the road) to relieve uncertainty over delivery of East Hall Farm extension. Would urge that route does not disturb existing development allocations. Will improve A2 corridor, open up other major development opportunities and be of wider benefits for Sittingbourne and Swale economy (Trenport Investments Ltd). 26. Complete SNRR to provide a better link from Ridham to east Sittingbourne avoiding ring road north of the town and Iwade area. 27. Complete SNRR to divert Coolchain lorries away from the town. 28. Complete SNRR and connect it to a new A2 which bypasses Murston, Bapchild, Teynham and Faversham and joins with Brenley Corner M2/J7. 29. Deal with SNRR problems including mass parking of HGVs on the road network causing litter and obstruction issues for other users (Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council; residents). 30. Need to improve and repair roads we already have and improve flow by rethinking and reducing traffic lights to improve flow. 31. Improve traffic management through Sittingbourne by reducing the number of traffic lights (residents and Bredgar Parish Council). | <p>audit, which will feed into evidence base and subsequently transport policy.</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>32. Replace traffic lights at Sittingbourne Retail Park and Snipes Hill; with smart traffic lights, better layout or roundabouts to improve flow. (residents; Tunstall Parish Council; Bapchild Parish Council; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>33. Sort out Swanstree Ave traffic light problems (Bapchild Parish Council).</p> <p>34. Sort out road layout at junction of Chalkwell Road and A2 as traffic turning right into Chalkwell Rd holds up traffic flow on A2.</p> <p>35. Lower Road should be improved and better maintained to handle occasions when A2 is closed.</p> <p>36. Traffic management solutions – all pedestrian crossings should be bridges or tunnels. Replace traffic lights with roundabouts. Ban all right turns in vicinity of a roundabout.</p> <p>37. If houses are to be built to the south of Sittingbourne then a new link to the M2 and J5A is essential. Would enhance effectiveness of SNRR and ease A249 pressures.</p> <p>38. The proposed KSP A2/M2 link looks good.</p> <p>39. An A2/M2 link is critical to improve the A2 corridor and this is a longstanding goal for the Council. It will relieve the A2 corridor; and reduce pressure on the A249 and M2/J5; and has the potential to relieve air quality issues along the A2. A new approach is needed to Swale's future growth and investment rather than continuing piecemeal. Only the Quinn Estates proposal is capable of funding and delivering this (Quinn Estates).</p> <p>40. Would accept M2/J5A and some development up to KSP only - but traffic must be satisfactorily dealt with.</p> <p>41. A2 extends from Faversham to Rainham – document has too much focus on east of Sittingbourne (Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>42. Give Teynham and Newington bypasses higher priority so as to make better use of their HS 1 stations, with housing within walking distance of the station and schools.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>43. Bypass Bapchild.</p> <p>44. Bypass Ospringe, Teynham and Newington to avoid choke points and find funding for them(residents and Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>45. HGV ban through Newington or consider charging and emission zone to reduce use of polluting HGVs (residents and Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>46. Do not permit any more HGV traffic generating developments along the A2.</p> <p>47. Only allow HGV traffic at night.</p> <p>48. Expand A2 corridor to accommodate Danaway Road.</p> <p>49. No further development should be allowed at Sittingbourne. All major new development should be at SE Faversham to take advantage of existing excellent road infrastructure there.</p> <p>50. Capacity of A249 is limited if there is further development at the western end of the Borough – development potential at Faversham and Boughton Street should be considered (Redrow Homes).</p> <p>51. With more housing the A2 (Faversham) will become a street and should be planned for accordingly. Traffic lights are more appropriate than roundabouts as they can be phased to allow for pedestrian crossings and promote permeability.</p> <p>52. Bypass Ospringe to M2/J6 to ease pressure on A2 east. Could also consider a bridge link from Oare to Harty Ferry to open up Eastern Sheppey.</p> <p>53. Dual carriageway to link M2 Faversham with M20 Ashford to provide alternative solution when there is a problem on the motorway.</p> <p>54. Insufficient knowledge to comment on Faversham road capacity.</p> <p>55. Rail network should be a key growth corridor. Further growth at Queenborough could take advantage of this, assist modal shift and sustainable transport patterns which would be accordance with NPPF (2012) para 35 and avoid A2 corridor problems (Wood PLC for Crown Estates).</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>56. Given geography of Swale, additional development will require improvement to A2 corridor, which will need to relate to the scale and location of development and the contribution such development can make (Gladmans).</p> <p>57. Plan development growth nearer to motorway junctions and through localised road link improvements, plus public transport to address town centre congestion. (Hume Planning Consultancy).</p> <p>58. Existing planned development and needs to be dealt with first. New development should not be allowed until existing problems solved. Requires strategic thinking and future proofing. A2 will already be further burdened by Bearing Fruits Local Plan development to 2031 (residents; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>59. Impact of local trips (school and shopping) on traffic appears ignored to date and has a real impact.</p> <p>60. Provide pick up and drop off facility at Westlands School which is off the A2.</p> <p>61. Provide parking facilities of the A2 for residential properties with no curtilage parking.</p> <p>62. Improving local schools should reduce pupil 'commutes' and reduce congestion.</p> <p>63. Parking already a nightmare around Sittingbourne Memorial Hospital.</p> <p>64. Make town centre parking easy to access (Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>65. Car ownership on the rise due to the housing crisis and more adults still living at home which will worsen the problem.</p> <p>66. Provide more and better subsidised public transport services (residents and Bredgar Parish Council).</p> <p>67. Improve existing rail stations and build new ones if necessary. Consider new railways or tramways or monorail.</p> <p>68. Road improvements need to be part of a wider package of measures including improvements to public transport, better access to rail and</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>modal shift to reduce stress on roads (Gladmans).</p> <p>69. Plan development with easy walking and cycle access to HS 1 rail stations (Gladmans).</p> <p>70. Arriva Click system in Sittingbourne offers potential to get people out of cars (Gladmans).</p> <p>71. Encourage use of public transport by making some buses 'fast' - not visiting all villages. Consider specialist commuter buses to link villages to rail stations. Bus services to rural areas just between 9am – 5pm do not address need.</p> <p>72. Higher council tax according to number of cars owned.</p> <p>73. Air quality issues caused by A2 congestion needs to be considered with greater use of electric vehicles and should improve things in time. Require more charging points and solar panels for these in new developments.</p> <p>74. 20 mph limit on A2 to reduce pollution will make the problem worse.</p> <p>75. Why cannot the Faversham Town Council initiative seeking a 20mph limit at Ospringe be applied to the whole A2 corridor?</p> <p>76. Extend 20mph zones through all conservation areas.</p> <p>77. National policy on emission standards needs to be tightened. Could also be used to displace lorry traffic.</p> <p>78. Pollution restrictions on A2 may not be feasible because of the businesses needing access to town centres and existing employment areas..</p> <p>79. Make Sittingbourne Town Centre electric cars only, freight will move to motorways and people will use local transport options for local journeys.</p> <p>80. Sittingbourne geography with railway and A2 bisecting the town causes traffic delays, a clean urban travel system should be considered.</p> <p>81. Ban HGVs from the A2 and require them to use the motorway – only allow use of smaller roads for 'last mile' delivery only within specified</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>time windows to minimise impact on residents.</p> <p>82. Stop HGVs using rural roads as short cuts.</p> <p>83. Coolchain at Teynham causes A2 congestion at Teynham – should be on Eurolink Estate with better road links.</p> <p>84. Repair potholes and fabric of roads - likely to cause serious accident (see Central Ave / Ave Remembrance/ Manor Grove). Roads signs not visible in some places.</p> <p>85. Suggests voluntary charge for residents towards road repairs.</p> <p>86. Whatever solutions are found countryside gaps between Rainham, Newington, Sittingbourne, Teynham and Ospringe must be retained.</p> <p>87. Footpaths and vegetation along A2 better maintained and widened for cyclists and walkers, but management regimes need to respect wildlife.</p> <p>88. Needs more in depth study – greater use of M2 and M20 (and railways) for HGVs and freight may help A2, but worsen the motorways.</p> <p>89. Question is outside remit of Natural England.</p> <p>90. Unfamiliar with Swale area, so not able to offer suggestions.</p> <p>91. Future modelling and consultancy should be independent of developers as they are likely to influence results in favour of reducing mitigation costs.</p> <p>92. The A249 is a major road linking Maidstone and Sittingbourne as well as the M20 and M2, and Maidstone Borough Council would welcome early engagement and discussions regarding any transport modelling work and any identified impacts upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Maidstone Borough.</p> | |
| <p>Q29 Improving access from the eastern end of the Isle of</p> | <p>37</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bypass direct from Sheppey crossing to Leysdown to be paid for by developers who wish to build on Sheppey. Needs to be a dual carriageway. 2. Build on brownfield sites before green fields (why was Whiteway | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic transport modelling is in hand (jointly undertaken with Kent County Council Highways to inform choices on reasonable alternative development |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| <p>Sheppey (the A2500/B2231): What further measures could be considered to improve accessibility to and from the eastern end of the Isle of Sheppey?</p> | | <p>Cromwell road community destroyed and not replaced).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. A new bridge from East Sheppey to Faversham linking to M2 via Western Link and an Ospringe bypass should be Council's main transport aim. 4. New bridge with better road links from eastern end of Sheppey. Crossing from Harty Ferry to Oare to open up poor quality land for development and an alternative route off the island. 5. Crossing from Leysdown to Conyer, but cost likely to be prohibitive without public finding. 6. Improve road and rail links and open up Eastern Sheppey for commercial development – new roads to be funded by development. 7. Capitalise on new Sheppey crossing by modernising roads to the east. 8. More dual carriageways. 9. Improve existing roads and road management on the island. 10. Improve Lower Road to increase traffic with better links to the two bridges. The diverge traffic with new links to Medway Towns and Faversham with better links to M2. 11. Widen the Lower Road and build a roundabout at junction with Barton Hill Drive. 12. Improve access by water to carry goods to London or Europe. 13. Improve public transport (and cycle links) by allowing new development on the Eastern side of Minster. Scocles Road site could make further improvements to the A2500, specifically through providing a roundabout at junction of Scocles Rd and A2500. (DLP Planning Ltd for MLN Land and Properties). 14. Use old rail line for cycle access. 15. Consider building a rail /tram / monorail link system to the eastern end of the island. Reinstate the light railway within the island. 16. Extend train services if there is clear demand, especially direct Sheppey to London and Canterbury. | <p>strategies and options for the local plan review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further more detailed modelling will be required to support whatever strategy is chosen for local plan. This will also be used to inform a local transport strategy prepared in cooperation with Kent County Council Highways and transport operators; as to a range of measures to support new development from reducing the need to travel; to means to encourage more walking and cycling; to improving public transport; and potentially for any future public funding bids to support such initiatives. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17. Extend the click and ride small bus services (like Sittingbourne) to the island. 18. Better bus service. 19. Develop Sittingbourne instead. 20. Study suggests Sheppey has no value or use for development – allow it to stay rural by not improving transport. 21. Current nature trails could be widened to allow both walkers and cyclists, but this would create more traffic as with everywhere else in rural Kent. 22. Question marks as to whether current values can sustain road infrastructure improvements to improve accessibility in this part of the district (Hume Planning Consultancy). 23. Not aware of any real requirement for improved access – no strong view. (Bredgar Parish Council) 24. Limited knowledge, but if strategy is to bring employment to the island, the accessibility problem needs addressing. 25. Question is outside remit of Natural England. 26. Question better answered by Sheppey residents. (Tunstall Parish Council; Rodmersham Parish Council; Five Parishes Group; and residents). | |
| <p>Q30 Sustainable transport projects: What are the next big sustainable transport projects that should be being considered?</p> | <p>64</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non car travel must be higher on the agenda than car based travel. 2. Improved rail network; services; and service reliability a must to keep people off the roads. 3. Better direct train service from Sheerness to London. 4. Improve all train services from Sheppey including linking to HS1 at Sittingbourne. Will cater for increased levels of migration to Swale from London for those in search of more ‘affordable’ homes and first time buyers. (DLP Planning for MLN Land and Properties). 5. Encourage use of rail links at Kemsley and Swale Halt and Selling. 6. Trams (or trolley buses) like Croydon or Manchester. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National policy (NPPF 2018) is clear on the need for local plans to focus development at locations which are or can be made sustainable through minimising the need to travel and offer a choice of modes of transport. The local plan review itself will need to respond to all of these issues through its development strategy; |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Persuade High Speed trains to stop at fewer stations to make it a faster service to London. Service from Sittingbourne slower than 30 years ago. 8. High Speed link to London Victoria. (residents; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). 9. Extend rail network with extra stations and / or trams / monorail off the existing network. 10. Direct train link to Maidstone would vastly reduce traffic. 11. Rush hour train services are inadequate to support and increase population. (Bredgar Parish Council). 12. Better services for smaller stations on the London main line (Newington Parish Council). 13. We need to make best use of ALL of the train stations within the borough. This includes Newington, Sittingbourne, Teynham, Faversham, Selling, Kemsley, Swale, Queenborough Sheerness. Unclear how much Swale BC can influence rail operators and network rail in this matter (Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). 14. Retain train link between Faversham and Ashford as A251 will not cope. 15. Kemsley station has poor facilities, but serving many more houses. 16. New settlement outside Sittingbourne would not provide means for commuters to get to the station. 17. Accessibility to existing stations should be a key consideration in location of all development. 18. Encourage rail rather than road freight, especially for eg manufacturing and distribution at Kemsley. 19. More parking needed at Sittingbourne Station. 20. Free community transport system to get cars off the road. Public transport is too expensive – explore options for cheaper local travel. 21. Consider subsidising bus and train use in the Borough to encourage high use (Bredgar Parish Council). | <p>policies to facilitate transport infrastructure provision; the design, layout an access elements of land allocation policies; and development management policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use information from cycle audit |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>22. Increased and regular local bus service. Reliability and regular services important for an ageing population and would have positive effect on A2.</p> <p>23. Smaller electric buses for rural communities especially to assist ageing population.</p> <p>24. Electric car ownership only on sensitive employment sites such as KSP.</p> <p>25. Work with local bus services on more creative schemes to encourage people not to take cars into Sittingbourne. Proper bus terminal in Sittingbourne Town Centre.</p> <p>26. Regular and reliable bus links needed to Medway, Maidstone, Faversham and Canterbury with hop on - hop off method of paying to save time. Levy for private car use unless medical emergency.</p> <p>27. Improved bus transport would be ideal, but not viable without subsidy.</p> <p>28. Dedicated electric bus routes and cycle routes to KSP/Eurolink – any expansion should be linked these policies.</p> <p>29. Implement Park and Ride on site at Foresters Lodge Farm (OSG Architecture Ltd).</p> <p>30. Reduce parking for petrol cars and prioritise electric car parking.</p> <p>31. Reduce parking overall and build high density homes (with integrated parking) on existing car parks.</p> <p>32. HGV only routes throughout Swale on brownfield land as the A2 and A251 cannot cope with HGVs.</p> <p>33. Encourage the Aviva click bus system.</p> <p>34. Enterprise areas with transport from station on demand.</p> <p>35. Worth another effort to make cycling a viable option.</p> <p>36. Cycling network essential to combat obesity, create stronger communities and avoid school run congestion. Essential to encourage children to walk or cycle further to school.</p> <p>37. Encourage cycling as ecologically sound (Bredgar Parish Council).</p> <p>38. Non car based solutions such as dedicated cycle paths and safe</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>pedestrian paths should be encouraged.</p> <p>39. Walking within towns and cycle routes extending further afield.</p> <p>40. Look at footpaths in rural areas.</p> <p>41. Cycle routes should be included in all development plans.</p> <p>42. Cycle storage needed eg at railway stations.</p> <p>43. Turn the Saxon Shore Way into a cycle path.</p> <p>44. Cycle paths are generally badly planned and maintained and are unsuitable for road bikes.</p> <p>45. Technology will play a major role in reducing pollution.</p> <p>46. Pedestrianize town centres except for deliveries 10mph limit and put more trees in town centres. More trees everywhere especially evergreens to absorb pollution.</p> <p>47. At Faversham: use link from Love Lane Phase II as a route from the sites either side of the A2 street. Could lead to better designed speed management in Whitstable Rd but having regard to fact this is a bus route. A 20mph limit across Faversham would be a big and affordable sustainability project. Footpaths from the outskirts of town to centre should be improved and maintained eg Preston Lane; Sumpter Way; footpath via Long Bridge/ Bramley Av and Selling Rd. Improve and add to crossings over A2 as this becomes a town street.</p> <p>48. Implement M2 J5 improvements. (Bredgar Parish Council; residents).</p> <p>49. Implement M2/J5 improvement before reviewing Local Plan and implementing radical change to development strategy through garden towns and villages. Impact on AONB of rat running. A2/ M2 link not fully justified, will impose unfair local cost burden; should focus on local road improvements.(Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>50. Adopted Local Plan does not require M2/J5A, review not required until at least 2031. Await new NPPF.</p> <p>51. Sittingbourne Northern Relief Rd should be completed before other big changes.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>52. Another M2 junction needed east side of Teynham.</p> <p>53. Would welcome early engagement discussions regarding sustainable transport projects and the implications that will be created on Maidstone's transport infrastructure. Swale Borough Council's future highways mitigation schemes should also consider mitigation for any impact upon the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and in particular road users, using the A2 as a cut through and the damaging effect of this on the AONB and the environment. (Maidstone Borough Council).</p> <p>54. Upgrade /widen M2 (residents; Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>55. Upgrade Brenley Corner.</p> <p>56. Sheppey Crossing bridge pillars degrading - need to plan Sheppey Crossing 2.</p> <p>57. Upgrade much of the A249 and A2.</p> <p>58. Complete Sittingbourne Northern Relief Rd.</p> <p>59. Bypass Faversham and Ospringe, Teynham and Newington.</p> <p>60. Link Harty Ferry to Oare and A2.</p> <p>61. Focus should be on improving the road network, not increasing spend on major public transport initiatives.</p> <p>62. Unlikely to persuade people away from cars. Car is king in Swale area.</p> <p>63. Cars will remain principal means of transport in rural areas for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>64. None rail network is already physically full; and road network already upgraded to maximum capacity – building new roads will only generate more traffic.</p> <p>65. Question is outside remit of Natural England.</p> | |
| <p>Q31 Planning, congestion and air quality: How</p> | <p>60</p> | <p>1. Technology will play a major part in reducing pollution. (residents; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council)</p> <p>2. Technology cannot be relied upon to provide an imminent fix, so the</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy will need to be reviewed in the light of the revised NPPF; transport evidence; and inform |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p>much should we be relying on future technological fixes to address air quality and congestion problems? What can be practically achieved by the planning system to mitigate or remove the adverse impacts upon air quality?</p> | | <p>current situation is increasingly worrying for health. Needs action now not in future. Needs high level political action and funding in response to public concern to drive this. SBC should support and implement any government initiatives on this matter. (residents; Newington Parish Council).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Technology is not a short term solution especially for HGVs. Strategic network improvements including the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road to help cars avoid town centres and villages is essential. Also encourage more walking and cycling for short local journeys in urban areas. (Montagu Evans for Quinn Estates Ltd). 4. Encouraging development of retrofitted particulate filters and emission improvements to existing vehicles rather than vehicle scrappage schemes that increase carbon footprint instead of reducing it. Encourage development of cars to last 25 years with tech upgrades throughout lifecycle. 5. A2 and other routes need to be improved, or little success. 6. All new developments should have electric car charging points. Provide charging points at suitable locations in existing towns. Promote use of electric cars and reduce dependence on diesel / petrol cars. 7. Seek to make local public transport (buses and taxis) reliant on clean energy. 8. Technological advances for HGHVs less predictable than for cars. HGVs should have time limited access to anything other than motorway routes. 9. Ban HGVs in AQMAs (Newington Parish Council). 10. Move more freight by rail. 11. Stop building in AQMAs, or where EU limits close to exceedance. Don't allow developers to take cases to High Court where AQ known to be poor (residents; Newington Parish Council). 12. De-allocate local plan allocations in areas where AQ known to be poor | <p>choice of development strategy.</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>rather than seeking money for mitigation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Do not build more than the absolute minimum and sort out existing infrastructure problems. 14. Charge drivers for pollution. 15. Restrict vehicle ownership to 2 per family. 16. Charge developers for pollution arising from their developments for the lifetime of the road. 17. Unreasonable to expect to reduce numbers of cars and lorries, but better traffic management and free flow can reduce pollution. Introduce sensible speed management; remove speed bumps and 20mph zones which restricts flow of traffic and creates congestion. 18. Improve traffic flows by removing signals and replacing with roundabouts which flow better (eg at Sittingbourne Retail Park). 19. Pedestrianize more town centres (except for deliveries and disabled badge holders) and have a 10mph limit. 20. More trees in the town centres. 21. Encourage walking and cycling, especially to new developments through provision of safe routes.(residents; Bredgar Parish Council). 22. Convenient bus routes which have frequent and reliable services. 23. More trains buses and cycle lanes. 24. Increased planting of trees/ hedgerows flora and fauna can be encouraged by the planning system. (residents; Bredgar Parish Council). 25. SBC must focus on both NOX and particulate matter. That latter is a significant problem where there are heavy traffic flows, especially where they are in close proximity to residential properties. Particulate matter must be addressed with regards to existing road surfaces and new ones. (Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). 26. Particulate matter, industrial pollution; agricultural pollution; A2 and motorway pollution needs to be addressed. (residents; Five Parishes Group; Rodmersham Parish Council). | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>27. A2 in Faversham should be planned and managed as a street.</p> <p>28. Phase out long distance commutes both by train and road. We should encourage train use in the opposite direction to peak travel. Perhaps hot office/deskings locally and commuting to London 2/5 days per week.</p> <p>29. Require parents to take children to local schools as this major cause of traffic in term time clearly reduces in school holidays.</p> <p>30. Enforce more zig zags outside schools and no parking within half a mile at drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>31. Schools should have AQ monitors outside their perimeters.</p> <p>32. Can only stop pollution by halting population increase of the area. Too many houses already built which increases cars and air pollution. Further 10,000 houses will negate any road improvements impact on AQ, as would airport construction.</p> <p>33. Disappointed at inconsistency in decisions at Pond Farm and r/o 99 High Street Newington despite being only a few hundred yards apart. Any increase in traffic in the narrowest part of Newington likely to cause more accidents and health problems. Feels residents not listened to on this matter.</p> <p>34. Maidstone Borough Council would welcome early engagement to assess the implications of proposed future development patterns in Swale and the potential traffic congestion and air quality impacts upon Maidstone. In any future strategic air quality modelling associated with Swale's growth plans, the assessment and any identification of mitigation measures should extend to include the impacts on air quality within Maidstone Borough.</p> <p>35. Air quality issues require further investigation through the Local Plan process. (Hume Planning Consultancy).</p> | |
| Q32 Securing net | 56 | 1. Yes, adopt formal best practice standards eg Building with Nature. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evidence base/research |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p>gains in biodiversity: What steps should we be taking to ensure that all projects, as far as possible, bring with them the necessary measures to secure real enhancements for biodiversity?</p> | | <p>(Inc. Newington PC, The Five Parishes Group, CPRE, Tunstall PC.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. National Policy expects huge new developments plus net gains in biodiversity. (Natural England, Environment Agency.) 3. Biodiversity does not develop overnight. 4. Policy provision and the input of key expert consultees, like KCC Ecology/Natural England/Kent Wildlife Trust already secure this. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 5. The LP needs to recognise work on delivery of the Medway Estuary and Swale Shoreline Plan and associated Strategy. Where compensatory habitat sites are identified, they need to be protected from development as per the NPPF. (Environment Agency.) 6. There is a growing use of houseboats in North Kent and they can be point sources of pollution - discharge of waste from galleys and heads. (Environment Agency.) 7. Would expect there to be protection for natural habitats, net gain from the planning system for all developments and promotion of biosecurity measures including requirements for the use of native species. (Inc. Environment Agency.) 8. Habitat/Biodiversity protection, enhancement and maintenance, with a strong integration blue/green infrastructure within all development proposals must be considered essential. (Inc. Environment Agency.) 9. Need a policy requiring planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) that has been approved by a biodiversity officer or ecologist employed by the Council. (Natural England.) 10. Clear indicators will need to be embedded within the monitoring framework for the LP and the need for the long-term management of habitats to be secured. (Natural England.) 11. Applications which include extensive landscaping should be | <p>may be required, such as a water cycle study and a green infrastructure strategy, as well as adhering to the NPPF's new "development must achieve a net gain in bio-diversity."</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>supported in rural areas where supported by the relevant LVIA and Biodiversity Statements.</p> <p>12. Preserve all current agricultural land and encourage local farmers to support as much bio diversity as possible. (Inc. Newington PC.)</p> <p>13. An important role is for education to provide information and raise awareness -- both for children and adults.</p> <p>14. Biodiversity should be built into standard planning permission. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>15. Is important to protect all forms of wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>16. House building on farmland and greenfield sites is a major contributory factor to the decline in biodiversity. (Newington PC.)</p> <p>17. Green spaces should be mandatory to all developments and adequate parking so residents do not have to pave over gardens.</p> <p>18. Not all species require an urban type of habitat, rural areas must be robustly protected.</p> <p>19. Need to protect our current countryside gaps.</p> <p>20. Large developments should be on brown field sites first.</p> <p>21. Protection of specific margins (hedges, tress and woodlands as well as wetlands) need to be included in the LP. (Inc. Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>22. Ensure proper waste management to stop fly tipping impacting.</p> <p>23. Encourage green spaces even if they are not designated nature reserves and create parks within urban areas and community green spaces.</p> <p>24. Make the developments, if they have to be done, small so the impacts are small, spread them around not just concentrated in several large areas.</p> <p>25. Protect the AONB and create an ANOB buffer zone and protect ancient woodland. (Bredgar PC,</p> <p>26. Assess the effect by light, noise and air pollution.</p> <p>27. To survey protected species does not capture the whole picture of bio diverse environment.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>28. Developers, landowners and farmers alike should be accountable to keep or provide wildlife areas.</p> <p>29. Building houses and thinking you can "manage" nature misunderstands what nature is.</p> <p>30. Encourage farmers to better manage hedgerows, shaws and woodland; restoring those that have been recently grubbed out. Consider funding of such environmental work to ensure that change for the better happens. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council.)</p> <p>31. Encourage wild meadows, and areas of natural wilderness that is managed rather than destroying our natural habitats.</p> <p>32. Do not allow development on any greenfield sites. (Inc. Newington PC.)</p> <p>33. Sensitive management and conservation is essential to the survival of the AONBs important biodiversity heritage and landscape quality. (Kent Downs AONB.)</p> <p>34. The Local Plan should include requirements for securing net gains in biodiversity in respect of applicable development proposals. (Kent Downs AONB.)</p> <p>35. Should be looking to expand Swale's productive agricultural land.</p> <p>36. Small scale developments have less detrimental impact on biodiversity because they allow corridors between areas.</p> <p>37. Insist on tree planting in all projects (native species and semi mature plants).</p> <p>38. Maintain/provide linked waterways to assist with drainage and habitat.</p> <p>39. Plant wild flower meadows.</p> <p>40. Build in nest boxes, bat boxes in any buildings, swift nest boxes, hedgehog routes where there is a known population and have nest boxes attached to any tall structures (grid towers, telegraph poles, etc.)</p> <p>41. Ensure funding is available for long term maintenance.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>42. After Brexit we should promote the production of our own crops and halt the need for so much container delivery on our roads.</p> <p>43. SBC should be checking and monitoring the site at the time the planning application goes in and then at regular intervals before planning application is reviewed.</p> <p>44. Current hedges and trees need to be preserved and properly maintained and an inventory created. (Inc. Tunstall PC, Rodmersham PC, The Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>45. Specific specialist local knowledge at SBC in these fields is absolutely critical. (Rodmersham PC, The Five Parishes Group.)</p> | |
| <p>Q33 Locally designated land: What should the approach be to the existing 'local designations' in the next local plan?</p> | <p>83</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complaints that the question itself is inflammatory. Designations are not only valued by local communities, as stated in 'Looking Ahead', but are in place as a result of a political process and of value to more than 'local communities'. 2. Retain and extend countryside gaps and don't build on them. They prevent urban sprawl/coalescence and protect natural environment across the borough (esp Sittingbourne). This will aid compliance with Government's 25 year Environmental Plan (including Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council, Tunstall Parish Council and Bredgar Parish Council). 3. Countryside gaps keep town centres vibrant, preserve village identity, wellbeing and social networks and contribute to Sittingbourne's and villages' long and rich history and economic viability. Gaps also provide a setting to villages, help air quality, bring biodiversity to communities, mitigate risks to soil erosion and surface water run-off and provide sustainable natural drainage (including by Bredgar Parish Council). 4. Stop the moving of countryside gap boundaries (eg as at Stones Farm, Bapchild) (Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council). 5. Faversham's countryside is protected more than Sittingbourne's. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of the local plan review, the policies DM24 (Conserving and enhancing valued landscapes) and DM25 (The separation of settlements – Important Local Countryside Gaps) will need to be reviewed and updated in light of the revised NPPF and reflect future development strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Wises Lane development is not keeping settlements separate. Massive garden village would swallow up existing villages and be an act of vandalism.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Enforce existing policies (and protection of gaps) before building new developments. 7. Build on brownfield before greenfield and do not allow more development creep. 8. What is a local designation and who decides what they are? Protect farmland. 9. Existing designations work well and should be retained. 10. Maintain and protect local designations and don't build on them – those who want to get rid of them have ulterior motives. Designations have value to local community and can help protect biodiversity, ancient woodlands, hedgerows etc. They also contribute to Swale 'feed-good'. 11. Preserve quality environment and create new local designations where required. 12. Keep local designations to preserve landscape and settlement character (Historic England). 13. Small scale development can be integrated into designated land, but not garden village proposals. 14. NPPF provides guidance on approach to be adopted. At revised draft this is at paragraphs 172 and 173 (Natural England). 15. Support review of local landscape designations to inform the Borough's development strategy, identifying suitable sites for development along with sites that need to be protected (Kent Down AONB). 16. Local designations are material consideration but reduce weight in certain situations eg custom build. 17. Apply a flexible approach to development of designated sites whilst retaining green space for community benefit (Kember Loudon | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Williams on behalf of client).</p> <p>18. Need to review landscape designations and countryside gaps including to west of Bapchild which should be allowed to grow organically (DHA on behalf of client).</p> <p>19. Review to ensure they remain of significant value to Swale in context of needs which need to be met. Eg local designation south east of Sittingbourne could enable the town to grow sustainably and can be designed to minimize/remove landscape harm (Gladman Developments).</p> <p>20. In line with governmental guidance, policy makers' spatial choices should be influenced by higher order environmental designations (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd).</p> <p>21. Review to ensure appropriate.</p> <p>22. More flexibility needed.</p> <p>23. Countryside gaps and AHLV are important but can have effect of concentrating development in other areas which further devalues these sites. (Newington Parish Council).</p> <p>24. Countryside gaps and AHLV should not be retained as they prejudice the LP's ability to meet area's housing needs. (Judith Ashton Associates on behalf of Redrow Homes).</p> <p>25. Promote new conservation areas around villages and proper enforcement of such (including by Tunstall Parish Council)</p> <p>26. Preserve and protect AONBs and Conservation Areas (Milstead Parish Council).</p> <p>27. Preserve setting of AONB and create a buffer zone north of the M2 (including Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council, Tunstall Parish Council and Bredgar Parish Council).</p> <p>28. Bring in extra designation below AONB.</p> <p>29. Some building in designated areas (eg AONBs) can be less damaging than building outside AONBs. Designations can put pressure on undesignated landscapes which also need protection.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Rebalanced approach needed.</p> <p>30. Landscape Character Area Appraisal may need to be updated to take account of allocations.</p> <p>31. Consult with locals for their views.</p> | |
| <p>Q34 Achieving good design: How can the local plan help bridge the gap between ordinary and extraordinary design?</p> | <p>51</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No need for this question as no further houses should be built. 2. By having a vision on what to have and building guide lines around that vision. Not going for the cheapest option. There should be minimum standards which should be included in the plan and below which developments should not be permitted. These standards should be expected in all applications. The ethos of 'in keeping' design should continue. 3. Extraordinary designs have their place but much of the history and character of the area is being lost as it is deemed to have little value. These things should be considered before extraordinary designs detract from areas they are supposed to be enhancing. 4. Applications which include designs exceeding the national standards should be given more weight than those that do not, i.e. better than 25% improvements on the current building control regulations. Some of the highest house design standards are to be found in custom/self-build applications. Land owners who live and will remain living on a site after a development are often uniquely positioned to enforce higher than usual house design standards. They are not subject to the same commercial pressures as a developer and often have more of a vested interest in an exceptional outcome. Applications brought forward by such land owners should be afforded additional weight over house builders and developers. 5. It can't. All design should be in keeping with the area's history and design. Historic villages should not be surrounded by any new, mass housing developments, especially when the Council is constantly telling people that we live in a conservation area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the existing design policies and SPDs and consider how they could be strengthened, for example through the formal adopted of 'Building for Life 12'. • Review any changes to national design guidance in the new NPPF. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>6. Small well designed hamlets across Swale in keeping with the area they are in, with well thought out infrastructure to reduce pollution. Special focus on the biodiversity of the area, protecting wildlife, woodlands and the local landscape. Tunstall School is a good example of poor design not in keeping with the area it was placed. Local people would have been more welcoming if the building was in keeping with others in the village and not left with the legacy of a large modern ugly construction that has blighted the landscape.</p> <p>7. Have innovative designs as the designs in Sittingbourne and many other towns are the same. Encourage the public to input and run competitions. Give the developers the incentive to produce better design.</p> <p>8. The design of local housing already built e.g. Iwade, Sonora, Great Easthall due to the high density of dwellings and lack of decent roads and parking are the sink estates of the future with all the problems to be found in such an area.</p> <p>9. Traditional designs are not necessarily bad anymore than extraordinary designs are good. Small scale developments tend towards more diverse design rather than massive development which tend to repeat similar designs because that's easier.</p> <p>10. The protection of listed buildings needs to be extended much more widely to consider the setting they are in beyond the land owner's barrier. Whilst the listed building owner has strict planning rules they have to abide by to maintain these valuable assets the land in the vicinity has no such protection.</p> <p>11. The move to enable building on green field grade 1 agricultural land has created a race to develop and receive maximum returns.</p> <p>12. Not sure who this question is directed to. The public is not in a position to comment on this without further understanding of the problems and how the current system works. I cannot see landowners, particularly farmers, being concerned about good design,</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>they just want the money. It would seem the council is not happy with the current scheme and if good design is not embedded as kite mark of excellence automatically into developments then that is a major concern. If you already see there is much room for improvement then that's what you should be trying to do.</p> <p>13. By never going for the lowest common denominator in costs or design and by having the greatest possible number of companies tendering for any work.</p> <p>14. The Council is well aware of what extraordinary design is, it is its willingness to not settle for anything less.</p> <p>15. By building in long-term developer financial responsibility for the maintenance of the buildings and infrastructure they build. That is the only way to ensure that standards of design and infrastructure are the best they can be. As an inducement, a portion of the council tax paid by the residents in the building would go to the developers, but there would be severe financial penalties levied on the amount that developers receive if there are maintenance failures.</p> <p>16. More rigidity on environmental and technical standards, but a more open mind on design.</p> <p>17. If massive housing developments are given the go ahead common sense will tell you that you will end up with a poor result – anything mass produced is almost by definition generic and built with the lowest common denominator in mind. If you genuinely want extraordinary design then give permission to smaller developments which are bespoke to the environment in which they are being built.</p> <p>18. Ensure housing and landscaping are maintained to a high standard by requirements set at the beginning of development.</p> <p>19. Good design can be achieved in many ways and there should be scope for high quality modern design to be supported. Historic character can be a template for promoting good design but new buildings do not have to slavishly copy or be pastiche in appearance</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>to fit well into existing areas' historic character. Guidance on this matter could be included in the local plan and/or supplementary planning documents. (Historic England.)</p> <p>20. By taking account of historical "ordinary" buildings and incorporating new design as history has always done.</p> <p>21. Explore other designs of architecture – be mindful of our discoveries of free solar – what architecture has proved to last in the past? Invite ideas and designs, not only from academics but from the public and school children.</p> <p>22. Housebuilder confidence needs to be increased in lower value areas, where higher quality materials and improved standards of design are more difficult to achieve. This can be addressed by creating greater confidence in the district, starting with directing a proportion of future growth to higher value areas of the district. (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.)</p> <p>23. The use of independent design panels should be encouraged on larger scale developments; however the planning policies of the local plan and/or relevant SPDs should be the mechanism to control development. These should not be overly restrictive so as to create viability and deliverability issues but should seek to control 'any place' design.</p> <p>24. Good design also considers the provision of multifunctional green infrastructure and environmental net gain. (Natural England.)</p> <p>25. The local plan should include policies to safeguard against ill considered poorly designed developments and encourage use of materials that will not degrade swiftly. Design factor should include consideration of sustainable use of resources. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>26. The current system is developer-led and motivated by profit. The Council likes the idea of design standards. (Newington PC.)</p> <p>27. Set high design standards and be able to defend the Council's position by disseminating and properly analysing developer viability</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>assessments or any alternative that might arise. The Council must not compromise on design because of cost pressures from developers. The Council must look at more imaginative design options that will last for many years. The problem we often see is that cheap external surfaces often degrade relatively quickly because of poor maintenance or poor construction and then look terrible and impact the whole streetscape. Proper consideration of the type of external surfaces must take into account their durability. If surfaces need regular maintenance then covenants or conditions should be put in place at the outset, this particularly important in large developments. We would suggest you look at development such as Eden Village or Toy Town to understand the issues here. (Rodmersham PC and The Five Parishes Group.)</p> <p>28. Build a vision of good design as part of planning permission/building regs, for example the Duchy of Cornwall/Kevin McCloud site. Offer architectural prizes/sponsorship/apprenticeships for Swale People. Homes for Life – Design. More engagement with the Swale public on their vision – easy to understand questionnaires readily available in supermarkets with incentive of prizes to complete. (Tunstall PC.)</p> <p>29. Design is subjective, from what I have seen of RIBA designs; they should never have got off the ground. They need to be innovative but not outlandish and as far as possible blending with surroundings.</p> <p>30. We need homes that are affordable for local people, we need bungalows that cannot be extended, we need proper “green” homes with solar panels, but we need to recognise our historic areas. We should not be allowing unsuitable designs in areas of high or special landscape value.</p> <p>31. The guidelines developed by the Faversham Future Forum are indicative of what could be achieved and could feed into a future neighbourhood plan. The points discuss issues such as conserving the built and natural environment, pedestrian and cycling networks,</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>traffic and parking, housing type, infrastructure and sustainability. (http://www.favershamtowncouncil.gov.uk/UserFiles/Files/FFF%20Development%20Criteria%20v5.pdf). The Council should use Building for Life, Building with Nature and BREEAM where it can. Ensure that layout, landscaping and materials are not creating an ‘anywheresville’ development. Oare Gunpowder Works appears as more imaginative. The two sites anticipated at Faversham are both very large which could be planned more as a master plan rather than a standard developer approach. This approach including Enquiry by Design is used by the Duchy of Cornwall.</p> <p>32. Conservation and heritage is a good thing but where materials are unavailable or not cost effective, an agreement should be made so it is possible to maintain the existing. Some listed or newly listed buildings can become prohibitive cost wise to maintain. In order to prevent neglect, some help and encouragement for alternative ways.</p> <p>33. Development within or affecting the Kent Downs AONB should include reference to development proposals needing to demonstrate how they have complied with the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and its supporting guidance. Additionally, the AONB Unit produces guidance documents such as the Landscape Design Handbook, Managing Land for Horses, Farmstead Guidance and Rural Street and Lanes – A Design Handbook. Reference to these should also be included to assist in meeting the objections of the NPPF and 2000 CROW Act. By using the term ‘Management Plan and its supporting guidance’ covers any new guidance which may become available over the life time of the plan. (The Kent Downs AONB Unit.)</p> <p>34. Building for Life is a good tool to achieve great design and has been shown to reduce objections as well as speed up the granting and delivery of permissions. (LRM Planning.)</p> | |
| Q35 The built | 53 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build on brownfield sites before greenfield (high quality) sites. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly to Q34, review the |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| <p>environment: What initiatives should we be pursuing through the local plan to improve the built environment, including for historic buildings, structures and areas?</p> | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Raise the profile of our historic past by publishing details of the history of orchards, brickmaking, papermaking and transportation by water on our creeks (Milton, Sittingbourne, Faversham, Oare). 3. Local historians should visit schools to explain our heritage. 4. Build a new museum with easy access and parking. 5. Regeneration and maintenance of housing estates, including bringing them back into public ownership so that they can be repaired or replaced with higher density housing where appropriate. These areas should be included in the local plan with the intentions worked up into a supplementary planning document. If estate regeneration affects annual target dwelling numbers, this should be progressed as an aim within the local plan. Some may need to be demolished with a view to building better accommodation while others may be fit for purpose by the modification of existing structures. This should improve the quality of life for those living there. 6. Increasing a multiple of council tax on empty properties once a building has been empty for more than one year and taking neglected properties into council ownership. After repair, they should be used for council housing, renting out properties for a peppercorn rent and allowing the tenants to improve them and maintain their tenancy for a required number of years. 7. Levies or developer contributions should be imposed to protect heritage assets affected by development. Ensure that proposals that will enhance existing assets are given support. Applications could be combined so that, for example, a small rural development could be permitted if it included measures to also protect and enhance a nearby heritage building, where such an approach had demonstrable local support. 8. Urban heritage should also be supported when considering traffic impacts and pollution. Steps should be taken to take action against owners who allow historic buildings and structures to fall into neglect. | <p>existing design and heritage related policies and SPDs and consider how they can be strengthened, taking into account the new NPPF and the heritage strategy currently under preparation.</p> |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>9. Provide grants to enable conservation works and provide advice to owners as to how to access funding for conservation/restoration of historic houses, listed building and heritage sites.</p> <p>10. Higher profile of our historic past. Local historians should visit schools and encourage children to understand their roots. Use one of our historic buildings as a museum and make it an interesting experience – our current heritage centres in disused shops do not have the appeal. History of our orchards, bricks and paper. The Council should provide funding/grants and the relaxation of council tax to enable the improvement of buildings in the current Town Centre. Many are architecturally invaluable, the cinema is 1920's Art Deco, being on the A2 and an old market town we have historic buildings hundreds of years old. (Tunstall PC).</p> <p>11. Article 4 directions should be used to try and improve the appearance of conservation areas, which should be maintained and reviewed to ensure they cover all areas of architectural merit. Conservation areas should be irreversible and set in stone.</p> <p>12. Consider adding to listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets. There should be policies compliant with the NPPF to consider the impact of proposals on heritage assets and their settings. Greater protection should be given to their setting. A local list should be initiated.</p> <p>13. More use should be made of Section 215 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to maintain standards of buildings and land within the Borough.</p> <p>14. Concerning that the Council does not have a major heritage assets strategy.</p> <p>15. New developments should complement the local area and be sympathetic to existing old buildings. Historic buildings should be a core part of design. Trees and grassed areas should be included as well as areas where communities can come together to sit, talk and</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>enjoy the environment. There should be more green space around all future development including schools, with a no car zone which would improve children's obesity and air quality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Ensure High Street face fronts have character. 17. Maintain and improve our heritage and historic buildings. The built environment should not interfere with them. Maintain them, where appropriate, through planning permission for minor modifications. 18. New housing should not be allowed to have an adverse impact on small rural villages where Grade 1 and 2 buildings exist, particularly in terms of traffic generating rat runs. Furthermore, lorry traffic should be restricted on rural roads as they cause damage to buildings and cause congestion. 19. There are a range of actions and programmes that could be adopted to conserve and enhance heritage assets. These should be addressed through the heritage strategy now in preparation. (Historic England). 20. Enforcement to ensure that owners of heritage sites keep them in prime condition. (Newington PC.) 21. Encourage conservation of heritage items through support of tourism and grant funding special projects. Preserve and extend existing land designations. (Bredgar PC). 22. Encourage alternative uses, particularly in town centres. For example, previous retail premises used for accommodation. 23. Better use of local materials to make new buildings blend in more. 24. Not allowing the building of any new mass housing developments within 5 miles of any conservation area. 25. Make it known that people willing to refurbish buildings of historic merit will be looked favourably upon. 26. The current policies restricting damage to or demolition of Listed or Scheduled Buildings should be maintained and enhanced. 27. Provide advice to owners on how to access funding. In addition, the | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Council should provide funding/grants to enable works to improve the built environment which could be fed into regeneration/town plans. (The Five Parishes Group and Rodmersham PC.)</p> <p>28. The plan should ensure that unoccupied buildings or those in poor repair are renovated. Many could have change of use from commercial to dwellings which will help ease the pressure on social housing.</p> <p>29. Engage locals in our history of this area by speakers, local press, posters in the library and post office etc. Have a stall at the local markets displaying our history, have a stall at the Kent County Show. Ideas from school children with prizes as a form of engagement. Repair our roads, plant trees; deliver Swale as a place to be proud of.</p> <p>30. Councils need a more pragmatic approach to work with owners rather than being perceived as an obstacle. This requires experienced inspectors.</p> <p>31. Re-instatement of the VAT relief on Listed Buildings would assist owners who would then have an incentive to maintain and repair heritage assets.</p> <p>32. Access to Conversation Officers needs to improve.</p> <p>33. Countryside gaps must be respected.</p> | |
| <p>Q36 Agricultural land: How can Swale keep the loss of agricultural land to development to a minimum, especially the highest quality land? Where high</p> | <p>92</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise brownfield land first and incentivise (majority view) (inc. Rodmersham, Tunstall and Bredgar PCs, Five Parishes Group). 2. Build higher densities and taller (inc. Tunstall PC). 3. After brownfield land used up, build on lowest quality agricultural land. 4. Use of any farmland is unfounded (inc. Milstead PC). 5. By not permitting development on agricultural land. 6. Put financial value on such land (inc. Tunstall PC). 7. Farming practices already putting land quality under threat. AONB and aquifer has particularly suffered. 8. Food production important to UK, finite resource/will be more | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consider the balance in Swale between using lower quality land and other considerations, i.e. viability and landscape quality. • Consider whether a potential development strategy option should prioritise lower quality agricultural land. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| <p>quality land is being considered for development, how can we balance the need for new development with the value and quality of agricultural land, particularly best and most versatile?</p> | | <p>important because of Brexit (majority view), need to be more self-sufficient/increase food security.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Follow the NPPF (Natural England). 10. Preserve until 80% of brownfield sites developed. 11. Council gave insufficient weight in previous plan to the prioritisation of sites on lower quality land (MLN Land and Properties). 12. NPPF should give it higher priority. 13. Loss of such land is inevitable (inc. Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd., Quinn Estates). 14. Swale is surrounded by local quality land use – use this. 15. Lobby Govt. for a more balanced concentration of housing across the whole country, rather than in the SE (Bredgar PC). 16. As a last result, agricultural land of less quality, but for small developments only. In worst case scenario, should also consider impacts on adjacent land (Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 17. Town centre land could be better utilised to provide live work units, offices, small work units, retail as well as residential (inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 18. To focus all development on Sheppey where there is low quality land would be at the detriment of an appropriate strategy (inc. Esquire Developments, Gladman Developments). 19. CPO agricultural land for a series of small land holdings for young farmers. 20. Use caution using Natural England maps as more detailed surveys show differences (Gladman Developments). 21. Undertake an urban capacity study. 22. Develop coastal areas. 23. Create centres of excellence for agriculture so that land is seen as a producer of jobs and source of local pride. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In due course, seek agricultural land quality surveys from shortlisted prospective development allocations. |
| <p>Q37 Green</p> | <p>60</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase open space provision and exceed minimum requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further investigation of all of the |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| <p>spaces: How can we better integrate green space needs so that we provide multi-functional spaces to both maximise health and well-being and biodiversity? Should we be increasing open space provision above that currently sought and should we be considering the adoption of existing best practice for providing green infrastructure, such as those offered by 'Building with Nature'?</p> | | <p>for green spaces. Need to ensure adequate funding to maintain in perpetuity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Look at best practice. (Inc. Natural England.) 3. Integrate green spaces into new developments. (Inc. Bredgar PC and Bapchild PC.) 4. Garden Villages must have significant recreational spaces but also easy access to the surrounding countryside e.g. new public footpaths. 5. Allow access to school's open space in the holidays/weekends. 6. The AONB is widely used; it is healthy, green and biodiverse already. Don't build an unneeded J5a to the M2 on it. 7. Pressures from population growth are the most important long term reason for the demise of nature. 8. We must protect keystone sites where either biomes or selected species are thriving and these sites must be given protection. 9. Maintain and create "wild life corridors." 10. Green spaces are vital for mental health, quality of life. 11. Funding must be set aside to maintain green areas for everyone to access them. (Inc. Bapchild PC.) 12. Building with Nature should be adopted. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council, Bapchild PC.) 13. Our natural green spaces are perfect - we do not need developers to attempt to construct artificial green spaces. 14. There must be connectivity and development must not shut off corridors for wildlife. (Tunstall Parish Council.) 15. Just a green area for play has limited use and often in new developments becomes more of a problem rather than an asset. (Tunstall Parish Council.) 16. Should make it legally impossible for them to be built on. 17. There are green spaces that are better suited to low-intensity use because of the archaeological and natural interest they contain. | <p>different types of best practice for green space provision and maintenance required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the GI Strategy and Open Space Audit evidence covers the issues being raised. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>18. There is a need for a range of green spaces.</p> <p>19. Create green spaces to encourage people to get out and exercise.</p> <p>20. Green spaces need to be multi-functional and accessible to the whole community; including those with disabilities.</p> <p>21. Support the provision of accessible, multifunctional greenspace which is within easy walking distance of developments. This will help to deliver health and wellbeing benefits for people along with habitat and corridors for wildlife and helping to mitigate the effects of climate change. (Natural England.)</p> <p>22. Measures should be secured to retrofit greenspaces to existing residential areas with the borough wherever possible. (Natural England.)</p> <p>23. Support the adoption of best practice criteria. (Natural England.)</p> <p>24. False mini green spaces do not allow for recreational pursuits such as hacking and rambling.</p> <p>25. By continually allowing development on our high grade agricultural land, you are causing the problem.</p> <p>26. We need bigger buffer zones around villages near the ANOB (Kent Downs.)</p> <p>27. Embrace the Government commitment to 25 Year Environment Plan.</p> <p>28. Build on brownfield not greenfield sites.</p> <p>29. Green spaces can be important because they are heritage assets, not just those designated as Registered Park and Gardens. (Historic England.)</p> <p>30. A nice utopian vision.</p> <p>31. We already have our green space; it's called the countryside.</p> <p>32. Green infrastructure should be provided alongside development. (Inc Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>33. Green spaces are needed around schools.</p> <p>34. Countryside wardens (possibly voluntary) would keep the</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>countryside accessible whilst protecting nature.</p> <p>35. Revision of councils waste sites policy.</p> <p>36. Hydroponics, fruit and veg grown on walls, etc and roof gardens are needed.</p> <p>37. Noise and light pollution needs to be considered.</p> <p>38. Cycle lanes needed.</p> <p>39. Appoint a Cllr with this particular brief.</p> <p>40. Instead of designating LGS's integrate green space within new developments. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>41. There must be connectivity. (Inc. The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council.)</p> <p>42. A Landscapes Officer and the specialist skills of a Tree Officer should be used to review designs and suggest improvements. Inc. (The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council.)</p> | |
| <p>Q38 The Swale challenges: Do you agree that the challenges for Swale in Statement 2 opposite represent the big challenges for Swale? If not, what would you include or remove?</p> | <p>58</p> | <p>Agree</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree in general. (Inc. MLN (Land and Properties.)) 2. Endorse those challenges that promote and protect the historic environment. (Historic England.) 3. Generally concur providing the environmental protection and enhancement includes the Kent Downs AONB. (Natural England.) 4. Focus on what we have already - HS1. (Tunstall Parish Council.) 5. Swale faces a number of complex challenges, broadly summarised in Statement 2. (Altimat Property Ltd and DHA Planning and SW Attwood & Partners.) 6. How can any of them can be delivered? <p>Include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Making the best of our USP (5 mainline HS1 stations.) 8. Opening up our waterfront locations. 9. Valuing in financial terms our countryside to understand opportunity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues to be considered at spatial alternatives stage ad in the CP and DM policy drafting. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>cost of development. (Tunstall Parish Council.)</p> <p>10. More skills training and apprenticeships needed.</p> <p>11. Challenge of meeting the increased demand for energy and the challenge of transitioning to a low-carbon economy. (Cleve Hill Solar Park Ltd.)</p> <p>12. Agricultural land as an amenity, encourage walking and put a financial value on the countryside. (Tunstall Parish Council.)</p> <p>13. Planning for and delivering new homes should be a main priority. This is not clearly expressed. (Altimat Property Ltd and DHL Planning and SW Attwood & Partners, MLN (Land and Properties.))</p> <p>14. Protect our countryside, villages and agricultural land.</p> <p>15. Improved transport links, leisure provision, green spaces, restaurants and shops.</p> <p>16. A lack of pre-school provision.</p> <p>17. Housing is needed but not at the levels suggested.</p> <p>18. Impartial and competent governance.</p> <p>19. Protect and enhance our countryside, green belt, rural villages, encourage wildlife and make more green spaces, which will aid air quality.</p> <p>20. More local employment.</p> <p>21. Ensuring developers provide community facilities and necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>22. Protection of the AONB, woodland and agricultural land.</p> <p>23. Define 'superb environment'.</p> <p>24. Green transport hub for Sittingbourne.</p> <p>25. Swale must address the perception that it is a poor and unattractive borough.</p> <p>26. Provide sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>27. Number one challenge you have is winning over the electorate.</p> <p>28. Rising lawlessness.</p> <p>29. Poor quality new builds and poor design.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>30. Any development in Swale should be on brownfield sites. 31. Concentrate on making Swale better not just bigger. 32. Policies and plans for managing water, sewage and waste. 33. Broadband fit for the 21st century. 34. Traffic models to better inform decision making about development. 35. Capitalise on our historical assets.</p> <p>Remove</p> <p>36. Your thoughts seem to be from a developer's brochure - remove or re-word it. 37. Superb place to live and socialise- this is already not the case.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>38. Emphasis on traditional town centres too great. (Newington PC) 39. Strongest labour market link is London and that is not changing. (Newington PC.) 40. Need right mix of housing in the right places. 41. Better consultation with residents on future plans. 42. Statement 2' is broad reaching and generic. (Bredgar Parish Council.) 43. Support the maintenance of the natural and agricultural environment while encouraging sustainable development to meet the actual housing needs of the Borough. (Bredgar Parish Council.) 44. The natural environment also presents significant opportunities to achieve sustainable growth and much wider ecosystem services and health and wellbeing benefits for current and future residents.(Natural England.) 45. Statement 2 is too generic and subjective. Is a lovely wish list but what does it achieve (Rodmersham Parish Council and Five Parishes Group.)</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>46. Keep spend in borough by best practice leisure/environment/countryside. (Tunstall Parish Council.)</p> <p>47. Meaningless words and 'pie in the sky'.</p> <p>48. Meet more of the housing needs of our existing population, rather than 'attracting' new people.</p> <p>49. Is this an extract from a children's book?</p> <p>50. Where is the statement going and how is it going to get there?</p> <p>51. Infrastructure necessities go beyond the obvious.</p> <p>52. This is like asking a child whether he hopes for good presents at Christmas.</p> <p>53. This level of growth is untenable.</p> <p>54. Statement 2 represents a big challenge.</p> <p>55. Swale challenges are the results of other people's greed.</p> <p>56. Not necessarily a useful nor achievable target.</p> | |
| <p>Q39 The current approach to meeting development needs in Swale: What would be the possible consequences of continuing with the current approach to meeting development needs in the Borough as set out by the existing adopted local plan</p> | <p>74</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Massive infrastructure problems (majority view), not solved by garden communities (inc. Tunstall PC). 2. Road (inc.A2) problems – congestion ('gridlock') and air pollution (inc. Newington PC). 3. Stick with current Local Plan/fit for purpose (inc. Tunstall PC). 4. Should reject any new approach as will create conurbation from Strood to Canterbury/stand up to Government/Swale becoming urban sprawl instead of mixture of communities/Swale like London without the benefits. 5. Thames Gateway is an anachronism/scrap planning areas. Will Faversham get more housing instead of Sittingbourne? Faversham = precious, Sittingbourne not so. Wrong that Faversham only gets 15% share when they are getting a new motorway junction. 6. Sclerotic Sittingbourne – too many houses, not enough infrastructure. 7. Erosion of rural nature of Borough. 8. Promotion of unsustainable growth to the west of the Borough, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any decisions on new spatial development strategy will need to be NPPF compliant in meeting housing targets. The revised NPPF concept of a 'stepped' housing trajectory could be considered assessing deliverability of alternatives. • Issues to be considered via spatial alternatives process. Begin to scope what the spatial strategy alternatives should be and how well the evidence and Sustainability Appraisal supports them. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| vision and settlement strategy? | | <p>creating less attractive and less popular places to live (inc. Newington PC).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Ensure a fair allocation, looking at south and east Sittingbourne, Teynham, Norton Ash and Lewson Street. Areas can benefit from existing infrastructure. 10. All brownfield land should be considered. 11. New M2 junction should be between Teynham and Faversham. 12. If you don't continue with the current approach it means you got it wrong. Jumping to an alternative is not a guaranteed fix. It means the adopted Local Plan should never have been adopted. 13. Loss of natural environment and farmland. 14. Increased crime. 15. Best to wait and see how current plan and Brexit pans out. 16. Smaller schemes would be more manageable, but garden settlements not as will blight areas for years. 17. (Quotes Looking Ahead) – “The truth is that the current planning and development model, which meets housing needs...by pressing sequential development into and up against existing communities, drives high densities and low quality, and so ramps up local people’s opposition to development. Such development, building on the next field, endlessly adding to existing communities, directs development to the very bits of environment most precious to people – at the end of their garden, the gateways to the town, the fields they most treasure precisely because they are on their doorstep. It makes new housing development politically toxic for local politicians. As a consequence, limited land releases result in high density, poor quality estates, often without services or jobs, without so much as a café or shop. Each proposal is fought at the planning stage as if it were the last word (stop it and protect the town), yet in reality each is just a small step on a never ending conveyer belt – gradually encircling the community with ever more dormitory housing estates” (inc. Newington PC). | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>18. Destruction of local communities leading to loneliness and alienation/social and cultural identity would be destroyed.</p> <p>19. More residents going elsewhere to shop.</p> <p>20. Concrete jungle with feral youths, rising crime and obesity.</p> <p>21. Lack of parking in towns.</p> <p>22. Hospitals full.</p> <p>23. Sufficient deliverable and developable land must be identified in places where people want to live and where therefore the market is likely to bring forward. Infrastructure must be paid for by developers even if paid for first by public authorities. Highly unlikely that current strategy will deliver the number of homes in the required timescale. Delivery has been over-optimistic and allocations made in locations with viability difficulties. Figure of 1,054 per annum will be higher to make up for under-delivery. Also key infrastructure will not be delivered as smaller scale of growth does not facilitate major infrastructure. Bolt on approach will only deliver same undesirable results. A new road link is needed to relieve pressures and this can only be done by large scale developments (Quinn Estates).</p> <p>24. Current strategy should remain largely in place, especially higher scales of growth in Thames Gateway, in particular on Sheppey. It is more affordable. An alternative strategy focussed on minimising high quality agricultural land loss should be considered.</p> <p>25. Will exacerbate affordable housing need and lack of infrastructure because of lower land values (Redrow, Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd.).</p> <p>26. Current plan is perfectly acceptable, but flawed because of delay in road improvements/upgrades. The main flaw/consequence of continuing with the current approach is that infrastructure (not just roads but health, education, welfare etc.) cannot be achieved because of the Councils failure to adopt a CIL. Focusing on a new A2/M2 link road and motorway junction 5A will be prioritised ahead of far more</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>essential improvements on the existing local road network. Building New “Garden” Towns and Villages is not the solution and will not address the needs of the existing communities. Main issue is to the delivery of schemes with permission and to stop land banking as this leads to more land being required. A2/M2 link road, junction 5a and completed Northern Relief Road support is not democratic plan making. Plan is being reverse engineered into this consultation and has been predetermined. Quinn’s Highsted Park scheme will be presented as a “fait au complet”. This is a fundamental breach of process and not in line with NPPF, there is no evidence to show the need or the impact of these schemes (Five Parishes Group and (part) Rodmersham PC).</p> <p>27. Implement J5 first.</p> <p>28. Need a radical change in strategy to meet housing and economic development needs (Trenport Investments Ltd).</p> <p>29. Adopted LP provides secondary focus of Faringdon. This ignores Faversham and it should therefore have a more advanced role with more sites identified that could improve the A2 (W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd).</p> <p>30. Current strategy is NPPF compliant and should be continued (Esquire Developments).</p> <p>31. Should extend the range of settlements being considered, particularly those with good access to services. Greenfield sites will be required as there is a lack of brownfield sites (Kember Loudon Williams).</p> <p>32. Statement 3 does not reflect experience of urban extensions – there are good and bad examples. Current settlement strategy is understood, but need to look at a wide range of development locations and types/sizes. Rural areas have not been well served e.g. Upchurch/Newington, whilst a new garden suburb will also be needed to meet long term development needs for LP review and post plan (Gladman Developments).</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>33. People would move from Sittingbourne and Sheppey.</p> <p>34. There will be no point in trying to get off the Island at peak times and during summer holidays.</p> <p>35. Garden villages are a flawed approach. Putting them on edge of existing towns and pretending they are not an urban extension is manipulative and deceitful. They would have to be a significant distance for existing towns and large villages which would mean going into 'untouchable' areas like landscape designation.</p> <p>36. Developers have no concerns of existing residents; no private sector funding should be used. PPI contracts provide the warning.</p> <p>37. Should development places like Halling and Swanscombe Peninsula – Councils should share sites like these of little landscape value/brownfield.</p> <p>38. You are scaring the readers – the world won't end.</p> | |
| <p>Q40 The local plan vision and settlement strategy: If the next local plan were to require a new vision, what are your views on the approach set out in table 8.1.1 over the page?</p> | <p>69</p> | <p>Comments on the alternative vision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcomes the environmental aspirations for the Borough within the alternative local plan vision. (Natural England.) 2. Pie in the sky. 3. The settlement strategy is agreed. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 4. The historical focus on the Thames Gateway should be revisited. (Hume Planning Consultancy.) 5. No new vision required. (Inc. Bredgar Parish Council.) 6. Broadly in agreement, but there is an in-balance in the distribution of development around Swale. 7. Would not be overly concerned at this stage about a revised vision. (Historic England.) 8. Does not mention meeting the boroughs housing needs, especially affordable housing. (Redrow Homes.) 9. Should address the air quality issues along the A2 corridor. (Quinn Estates Ltd.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A diverse range of suggestions for both inclusion and deletion in the vision. Members will need to give a steer on what to include in a new vision, prior to development of reasonable alternative development strategies. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>10. A vision to attract a further education facility to the Sittingbourne to strengthen the local workforce. (Quinn Estates Ltd.)</p> <p>11. Agree with the broad principles set out in the vision. (Gladman Developments.)</p> <p>12. Concerned about the use of LVC and suggest the vision consider a range of means by which infrastructure, services and assets can be paid for. (Gladman Developments.)</p> <p>13. Current LP vision is still relevant for the future.</p> <p>14. A reasonable vision. (Inc. MLN Land and Properties.)</p> <p>15. Fantasy.</p> <p>16. Aspirational but unachievable.</p> <p>17. Bullet point 2, in the 'We have accomplished' section, should be expanded to recognise the role of the other towns on Sheppey should play in rejuvenating communities on the island. (MLN (Land and Properties)).</p> <p>18. Each town should have a fair share of new development and has the right to retain its own 'special, distinct and separate identity'.</p> <p>19. It's not an alternative, it's a misleading statement of what the council think they might be able to achieve.</p> <p>20. How will the alternative vision be achieved? What "flexibilities" can suddenly achieve this utopian miracle? The new version has to be drastically different.</p> <p>21. The next local plan does not require a new vision except to consider sharing housing development quotas more equally.</p> <p>22. Is a whimsical force and has no place in factual document.</p> <p>23. The last paragraph "At our rural communities" would be hard to believe if Swale continues with their current policy of build wherever.</p> <p>24. Looks undeliverable if the concentration of development is focused on Sittingbourne and Sheppey over Faversham.</p> <p>25. Table 8.1.1 is pure fantasy; was it composed by consultants with</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>only rudimentary knowledge of the local area?</p> <p>26. I would love to live in this perfect scenario but I am a realist and to deliver all such ideas?</p> <p>27. Would like to see specifics, this is too generalist.</p> <p>28. Get the infrastructure in place that has been planned or discussed for 10 years or more first.</p> <p>29. Ensure when planning for new houses or new development is given the timescales for completion are met and penalised if not.</p> <p>30. Ensure investment in skilled jobs is a priority not low grade jobs that are at risk of being lost through automation.</p> <p>31. Use the assets we have in Sheerness, Sittingbourne and Faversham town centres not create more sprawl.</p> <p>32. Ensure brownfield sites are reviewed and identified for priority development.</p> <p>33. Ensure we maintain our bio diversity and protect the villages and green boundaries that the wildlife needs.</p> <p>34. Return the land to agriculture use in light of Brexit.</p> <p>35. New employment needs to be quality employment.</p> <p>36. An FE facility is needed.</p> <p>37. It is not fact but based on trends.</p> <p>38. Stop aiming for more, except as really necessary to accommodate the current population, and aim for better.</p> <p>39. The Thames Gateway is the area where growth should be concentrated, and is less likely to impact environmentally.</p> <p>40. The approach in the table sounds great - as long as it doesn't involve building on greenfield sites.</p> <p>41. The vision is quite ambitious but is a desirable programme to work towards.</p> <p>42. A new vision with HUGE assumptions of what you might have achieved in the future.</p> <p>43. Expansion for fewer houses in Doddington, Newnham, Eastling,</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Sheldwich Lees, Upchurch, Lynsted. This would accommodate families or provide priority for families already in these areas.</p> <p>44. Include the recognition of the need to include development of suitable sites in rural areas to meet its needs for housing and employment. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>45. Should provide the opportunity to review that the role of suitable sites within the countryside. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>46. It is open to many different interpretations and provides no detail. (Inc. Newington PC.)</p> <p>47. A more positive and encouraging approach should be given to the development of sites that are located within the countryside but well relates to existing villages. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>48. Alternatively let's look at Sittingbourne 2038: so many houses have been built that the housing market has collapsed, no sustainability in the job market and road infrastructure is inadequate. (Milstead PC.)</p> <p>49. Please refer to table 8.1.1 (page 34) and relate it to any known facts. (Milstead PC.)</p> <p>50. This proposed vision is supported, particularly the elements that refer to "fresh and innovative approaches to new locations for growth and their long term management". (Owners of land at Ashford Road.)</p> <p>51. Support the section of the vision that relates to Faversham, stating that "development has exploited accessible locations to achieve economic success and has shaped a special, distinct and separate identity that respects the town." (Owners of land at Ashford Road.)</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>52. Build any further housing in Scotland.</p> <p>53. A2/M2 link a must.</p> <p>54. The vision set out under 8.1.1 is quite ambitious but is a desirable</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>programme to work towards. Overall, it would create a better Swale while retaining the character of the area. In Faversham, if there can be an improvement in services, then this would be welcomed but is not all in Swale's control.</p> <p>55. Important to maintain valued elements of local character such as historic environment and the good quality of the local countryside around Faversham.</p> <p>56. More emphasis should be placed on developing skills for the 21st century economy.</p> <p>57. The regeneration of the town centre should include residential.</p> <p>58. Garden Villages could provide the best opportunity to provide quality housing.</p> <p>59. Development of KSP and Eurolink is a must for much needed jobs.</p> <p>60. Share development equally across Swale and build more in Faversham and Boughton. (inc. Tunstall PC.)</p> | |
| <p>Q41 Village housing: Parish Councils and rural communities are asked to consider whether they would be willing to consider limited releases of land in their areas to support housing needs?</p> | <p>61</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bapchild has minimal land left following the 600 house Stones Farm development. The most important open space remaining on the South side of the A2 is a designated countryside gap which should be upheld. 2. No, not in and around Newington. Development has been beyond capacity in past years and organic growth is the right way to increase rural housing. There has been irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The same is said for Upchurch and Hartlip. (Inc. Newington PC.) 3. A small amount would not result in over 12,000 new homes and the biggest house building scheme in England at present. 4. The principle is good but only for small pockets that would not impact upon the village, conservation areas or neighbouring villages (coalescence and identity). 5. Yes but proportional to the current village population and designed to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress work on the rural settlements study as a piece of evidence base when considering the sustainability of village expansion. • Progress work on the SHLAA and SHMA to consider the type and tenure of dwellings required and the sustainability of sites submitted in village locations. • Determination of the settlement strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>be in character with the village so they are not swamped and their setting harmed. (Inc. Bredgar PC.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Build on brownfield sites before greenfield sites and use empty properties first. Each Parish Council should keep a register of brownfield sites. 7. No. Biodiversity is being killed off. 8. Not opposed to any new housing in the AONB, particularly if development increased the supply of affordable housing for those with proven local needs. However, it would need to relate well to existing villages, be of a limited scale and complimentary to local character in form, setting, scale and contribution to settlement pattern. Advocate the use of landscape capacity studies to ascertain the capacity of AONB villages. Opportunities for growth at Neames Forstal are considered very limited. (Kent Downs AONB Unit.) 9. Providing impacts to designated nature conservation sites and the Kent Downs AONB are avoided and the least environmentally constrained sites considered. (Natural England.) 10. Yes, this should be dense. (OSG Architecture.) 11. What do you mean by limited releases of land? For example, 10 units in pocket development could be considered but no substantial increases that would undermine the fabric of the villages. Parish councils aren't against all development but it needs to be relative to the scale of each village. Much of the as yet undeveloped land is agricultural and its protection would tend to exclude housing development. (Rodmersham PC, Tunstall PC and The Five Parishes Group.) 12. Further development in Teynham would be foolhardy due to a lack of transport and community infrastructure. If a suitable local with good road links could be identified, the new settlement proposal is attractive. (Teynham PC.) 13. It is vital that villages grow so as to prevent the problems of | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>demographic change and subsequent viability of local services. There is considerable untapped potential for well designed, appropriately scaled new development in rural areas which could give rise to investment in services and infrastructure if the needs are properly considered. Villages should have the opportunity to grow in a way that creates links with larger settlements. (Gladman Developments and Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>14. It is wrong to ask this of parish councils and rural communities who live there for a reason and forgo the other perks of living in a town.</p> <p>15. Small amounts spread around the villages, in a way that would not destroy current communities, would be fair (including rectifying the fact that Faversham has always seen less development for housing).</p> <p>16. The charm and appeal of our villages should be protected and not underestimated.</p> <p>17. Apart from small-scale housing to meet local needs for local people (including bungalows), villages should not be the focus for development. There may be limited scope on a piecemeal basis but this would not provide anywhere near enough.</p> <p>18. Parish councils should have more say and power to decide what land should be offered. Some have worked hard to develop their own plans. Swale BC ignores these – why ask if you are not going to listen.</p> <p>19. The Council's current/previous policy to prevent most villages expanding has also prevented their natural growth and viability, leading to the current issues.</p> <p>20. This is a statement not a question and is already happening. The whole of Swale should be treated fairly as Faversham has only received 15% of housing allocations. The release of rural land should be a last resort. Many communities have little or no infrastructure. None should be released where there would be an impact on heritage assets, wildlife habitats, health, education and congestion.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>21. Small amounts of housing are needed for villages and hamlets to survive, but these must be affordable to people who currently live there. E.g. 4 locally restricted houses could be built alongside 2 market houses, or 2 & 1. This could amount to houses being tastefully and inclusively incorporated. Minimising the loss of BMV agricultural land is essential. Building on Sheppey needs to be accompanied by a second exit from the island east towards Faversham. This would help regenerate this end of the island and provide greater employment and leisure flexibility between the 2 extremes of the borough. A new link from the island onto the Western link and a new connection with the M2 around Ospringe would have huge benefits. New settlements have to be entirely away from existing towns and large villages, all of which have been pushed beyond reasonable growth in recent years and away from the A2/A249 corridors which are beyond capacity.</p> | |
| <p>Q42 Elements that could be included in our future spatial alternatives for the distribution and location of development: What elements should be further considered for inclusion as spatial alternatives for the distribution of development in Swale?</p> | <p>67</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main Issue. 2. Support for focussing more development at Faversham but not on Grade 1 agricultural land or other land that is high value for wildlife, flora or fauna. 3. New development should only take place on brownfield land 4. Develop brownfield land first before greenfield sites. 5. Larger scale developments should not take place adjacent to historic villages due to the detrimental impact it will have on their character. 6. Avoid allocating development on land that impacts designated nature conservation sites and the Kent Downs AONB. Sites with the least environmental impacts should proceed for further consideration through the Local Plan process (Natural England) 7. Objects to 'garden villages' as concerned they will create dormitory housing estates on a massive scale. 8. Consider all sites put forward. (OSG Architecture) 9. Building on Isle of Sheppey needs to be accompanied by additional access towards the east near Faversham. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be considered alongside all other evidence and Sustainability Appraisal in identifying reasonable alternative options for development strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Minimise the loss of BMV agricultural land. 11. New settlements should be located away from existing towns and large villages as these have already been developed to the limit. 12. New settlements should be located away from the A2/A249 corridors that are way beyond capacity. 13. Councils should take a holistic approach and work together to provide housing where there are good transport links and infrastructure. 14. High density development should take place in central locations. 15. New development should include, as a minimum, pre-school, school, GP surgery and shops. 16. A hybrid approach of the options is required. Building blocks of the Local Plan should be to focus on Sittingbourne with appropriate growth (Where deliverable) in other settlements in the Thames Gateway. Supplement this with growth in the rural areas and consider what can be delivered in the Faversham area. 17. Support 'new settlements' approach to housing delivery around Sittingbourne and rural areas.(Gladman Developments). 18. Piecemeal developments could result in better integration of new residents and should be focussed around mainline stations. 19. Ensure retention of character and 'sense of place' of villages. 20. Piecemeal developments could result in better integration of new residents and should be located around main line stations and town centres. Large developments will need infrastructure and delivery timescales are longer – this approach could undermine the Local Plan. (Tunstall Parish Council) 21. Full account of the AONB designation needs to be taken into account in determining an appropriate development strategy. The strategy should favour the allocation of development on land of a lesser environmental value. (Kent Downs AONB Unit) 22. The Local Plan should contain criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting landscape areas will be | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>judged and should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. (Kent Downs AONB Unit)</p> <p>23. The spatial strategy should take into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to deliver assessed housing need, within the plan period and at a higher rate than experienced recently • The need to avoid the loss of higher quality agricultural land • Making improvements to public transport and accessibility across Sheppey and links to HS1 and London. <p>24. The quantum of development on Sheppey could be increased.</p> <p>25. The inclusion of a new settlement should not distract from the benefits of maintaining or increasing growth levels on Sheppey.</p> <p>26. It is unlikely that a new settlement will deliver a significant proportion of new homes within this plan period (MLN Land and Properties Ltd).</p> <p>27. Preserve agricultural land and protect the countryside gaps between towns and villages and around villages.</p> <p>28. It is considered that the options for growth and development set out in “Looking Forward” should all be considered as part of the preparation of a new local plan, provided that the objectively assessed development needs are planned for with the allocation of additional sites for new housing and employment. As such, whilst minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land should be encouraged, this would depend on the availability of appropriate sites (S W Attwood & Partners).</p> <p>29. A greater degree of flexibility in relation to the future distribution of housing within the Swale Borough is supported.</p> <p>30. There should be a presumption in favour of new housing development at other established settlements in the Borough where the site can demonstrate good sustainability characteristics. Organic growth in sustainable locations is the best solution to increasing the housing stock in the Borough rather than focussing new housing in one location The Council should also revisit the potential capacity for increasing the</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>number of units at current allocations (Anderson Group).</p> <p>31. Objects to idea of Garden Village south of Sittingbourne on the basis of the negative impacts on loss of farmland, wildlife and biodiversity. The impacts will result in the urban sprawl of Sittingbourne. Expansion of Faversham is a better alternative as it has good train links and is well located for the M2.</p> <p>32. Coalescence of settlements should not be allowed. Sittingbourne has taken more than its fair share and other areas should now be considered.</p> <p>33. Garden villages will require considerable infrastructure and their locations should be given careful consideration.</p> <p>34. Convert derelict and empty town centre properties for residential use, build on brownfield sites.</p> <p>35. Stop building retail development when there is a large number of vacant shops already on our High Streets.</p> <p>36. New garden towns and strategic urban extensions that can deliver infrastructure and are located where land and sales values can sustain not only infrastructure provision, but quality design and development. (Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd).</p> <p>37. Regardless of the future growth strategy, environmental and infrastructure capacity constraints will need to be reviewed to ensure that the full growth requirements are appropriately delivered. Subject to there being no significant constraints identified which could not be overcome through the Local Plan process we support the continuation of the current approach.</p> <p>38. Supports growth around the Thames Gateway area at Newington and Sittingbourne.</p> <p>39. Support for high density development on brownfield sites. (Bredgar Parish Council)</p> <p>40. More balanced and evenly distributed growth pattern across Swale Borough is supported. This will allow pressure to be reduced on</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>physical and social infrastructure in Sittingbourne and enable a more balanced approach to development to be taken across Swale, potentially with the allocation of a greater proportion of sites around Faversham. (Owners of Land Ashford Road, Faversham).</p> <p>41. The Local Plan strategy should seek to plan for small in-fill developments through to entirely new settlements. Given the practical challenges of delivery (including the availability of manpower), the strategy should open up opportunities for small builders, through regional development companies, to the largest national housebuilders, each of which compete for slightly different segments of the market. Without taking this approach, the important contribution that smaller sites that are in and adjacent to lower-tier settlements can make to improved and accelerated delivery is lost. Concentrating employment uses in a small number of areas does not maximise opportunities for using available infrastructure across the whole of the borough or access to all sub-markets. (Landcap).</p> <p>42. Remove the 85/15 split of allocations in favour of the Thames Gateway. The new plan should adjust the balance remedying the effect of previous years to support more development outside of the Thames Gateway. (Newington Parish Council)</p> <p>43. Faversham should be a location for new development.</p> <p>44. New settlements should be assessed using criteria such as those in Peter Brett but also in other criteria about sustainability in the NPPF and other policies in the local plan</p> <p>45. Boughton has the capacity to accommodate more housing and should be given greater consideration.</p> <p>46. The Council should be looking to the eastern part of the borough where land values are higher and the scale of affordable housing provision can be greater</p> <p>47. Minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land and as such focusing growth on the Isle of Sheppey is not in our opinion a</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>sustainable option as it focuses growth in low value areas where affordable housing and infrastructure delivery will be significantly less than could be achieved elsewhere – esp. in the eastern part of the borough around Faversham and Boughton. Similarly, for the reasons set out in para 8.2.18, we do not believe that the identification of a new rural settlement is a realistic option in Swale, or that a dispersed approach to development within the rural areas is a sustainable or appropriate option. (Redrow Homes)</p> <p>48. There should be an equal share of housing spread across the borough rather than focussing on the Thames Gateway. No more infill development around the A249 as its at saturation point.</p> <p>49. Make more use of the Faversham area around M2J7 / Thanet Way and A2 towards Canterbury, multiple existing access routes already existing.</p> <p>50. If Oare and Eastchurch were connected that opens up a large area of untapped potential land on the mainland and island.</p> <p>51. Ensure a fair allocation of future development and economic opportunity across the whole Borough rather than focussing on Sittingbourne and the Thames Gateway.</p> <p>52. All the options for growth and development should all be considered as part of the preparation of a new local plan, provided that the objectively assessed development needs are planned for with the allocation of additional sites for new housing and employment.</p> <p>53. OAN should not be at the detriment to the character of settlements and therefore consider that the sensitive expansion and intensification of existing settlements, supported by essential infrastructure, would also be a sustainable and suitable approach.</p> <p>54. The majority of new development and growth is encouraged in and around the main urban settlements in the existing settlement hierarchy and that the needs of rural communities should also be planned for. To do this further expansion of villages with the provision of supporting</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>services is needed. (Altimat).</p> <p>55. Consider all options although it is likely a combination of approaches will be needed to secure the range of options to ensure development is delivered from small to large scale and short to long term.</p> <p>56. Supports the removal of the 85/15 split.</p> <p>57. Supports a greater proportion of development needs being met in Faversham area.</p> <p>58. Supports the maintenance of gaps between settlements to protect their character and communities.</p> <p>59. More information/explanation of the infrastructure needed and how it will be provided is required.</p> <p>60. New housing should be evenly spread around each area of town so that the impact is shared but not at the level suggested. Sittingbourne should not have to bear the brunt of the need identified.</p> <p>61. All options should be fully explored, not just New Settlements. If New Settlements fail to deliver, the whole local plan will be undermined creating bigger problems.</p> <p>62. A flexible approach is needed to meet future growth which comprises a mix of the spatial alternatives identified within the Looking Ahead document.</p> <p>63. The focusing of growth towards a specific location, such as new settlements is a logical approach but given the levels of growth needed, it should be combined with other alternatives. Growth at larger existing settlements in sustainable locations and dispersing rural growth across a wide range of villages is needed. Bapchild is an appropriate location for growth because it is in a sustainable location close to the services and facilities of Sittingbourne, and will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities as per the NPPF. The land proposed for allocation at Bapchild has the ability to deliver retail and/or community facilities as well as housing, thereby directly helping to enhance the vitality of the Bapchild community.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>64. A strategy of 'new settlements' is not justified. Failure to deliver or delays to the delivery of new settlements will undermine the whole local plan.</p> <p>65. Does not agree with the housing need figures identified. Considers new housing should be for local need only.</p> <p>66. Question the validity of the options presented and consider the 'new settlements' strategy is purely being promoted to deliver new junction on M2 (The Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham Parish Council).</p> <p>67. A strategy of 'new settlements' is not justified. Failure to deliver or delays to the delivery of new settlements will undermine the whole local plan.</p> <p>68. Does not agree with the housing need figures identified. Considers new housing should be for local need only.</p> <p>69. The current settlement strategy does not enable all parts of the housebuilding market to make an active contribution to the delivery of housing in the Borough. There should be a greater range of small in-fill developments through to entirely new settlements. The strategy should open up opportunities for small builders, through regional development companies, to the largest national housebuilders, each of which compete for a slightly different segment of the market. By focussing delivery on large sites in higher-tier settlements the important contribution that smaller sites that are in and adjacent to lower-tier settlements can make to improved and accelerated delivery is lost.</p> <p>70. Similarly, concentrating employment uses in a small number of areas does not maximise opportunities for using available infrastructure across the whole of the borough or access to all sub-markets. (Landcap)</p> <p>71. All options for growth and development should all be considered as part of the preparation of a new local plan, provided that the objectively assessed development needs are planned for with the allocation of additional sites for new housing and employment. As such, whilst</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land should be encouraged, this would depend on the availability of appropriate sites.</p> <p>72. Higher density re-development of brownfield sites within existing settlements (close to transport nodes) should be encouraged but not be at the detriment to the character of existing settlements. The sensitive expansion and intensification of existing settlements, supported by essential infrastructure, would therefore be a more sustainable and suitable approach.</p> <p>73. The majority of new development and growth should be encouraged in and around the main urban settlements in the existing settlement hierarchy but the needs of rural communities should also be planned for with the even expansion of villages. Dispersed growth is therefore encouraged.</p> <p>74. Support the delivery of a new locally led garden community as an approach to delivering medium to long term growth, provided suitable sites were put forward that were deliverable within a reasonable time frame. We are of the view that suitable sites should have well established transport links offer the potential for improvements to public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>75. The coalescence of settlements and villages is not supported and any new settlements should be located in areas of limited landscape value.</p> <p>76. The strategy must be changed to enable all parts of the housebuilding market to make an active contribution. This should be done by planning for small infill developments through to entirely new settlements.</p> <p>77. Given the practical challenges of delivery (including the availability of manpower), the strategy should open up opportunities for small builders, through regional development companies, to the largest national housebuilders, each of which compete for slightly different segments of the market.</p> <p>78. The current settlement strategy does not positively enable this. The</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>important contribution that smaller sites that are in and adjacent to lower-tier settlements can make to improved and accelerated delivery is lost.</p> <p>79. There are a number of sustainability benefits to developing smaller sites in lower-tier settlements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more balanced growth rather than concentrating growth in larger communities (which is not always the most sustainable option) • there is likely to be more capacity on highway networks compared with the main towns where infrastructure is a known constraint on housing delivery • it provides new housing stock for local family units which can prevent people from moving out of the village / parish out of necessity when they form new households; • it can deliver much-needed affordable housing as well as CIL receipts given that such locations tend to be more viable than, for example, large regeneration sites; • it enhances the viability of local businesses such as shops and pubs because of the increased customer base; • it similarly provides more users of public facilities and thus can help to prevent their closure or consolidation with facilities in other settlements • it can create new local jobs; and • they provide ideal plot sizes for smaller housebuilders which can help to accelerate delivery. (Quinn Estates). <p>80. Concerned about the infrastructure requirements and the need to deliver homes at pace, particularly given the persistent patterns of under delivery in the Swale Borough. It is unlikely that a new settlement could maintain the requisite level of growth over the full Plan Period. To support this level of growth and a wholly new settlement, significant infrastructure delivery is required including a wholly new junction (5a of the M2). This is on top of a substantial investment in social infrastructure (schools, health and open space), new roads and</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>drainage infrastructure. The level of investment required at a new settlement will hinder the delivery of new homes in a timely manner and it poses a significant risk to the deliverability of the Plan within the time horizon to 2038. This is likely to hinder the Council in maintaining a deliverable supply of housing at a time when the five year housing land supply is already marginal.</p> <p>81. Therefore, a new settlement is likely to be only part of the solution. To save placing reliance on a new settlement to maintain a rate of delivery, the Plan should allocate a mix of sites, including alternative urban extensions in settlements such as Queenborough. This will provide flexibility in supply and thereby allow the Council to more quickly respond to fluctuations in delivery than the approach which is over reliant on a new settlement. This will be able to deliver homes more quickly given the range of facilities and infrastructure immediately adjacent to the site. The Local Plan should provide a responsive and flexible supply of housing to maintain housing delivery achieved through allocating more sites and making it clear that sustainable development will be supported in order to comply with the NPPF. (The Crown Estate)</p> <p>82. The Council needs to ensure that any proposed spatial strategy identifies a portfolio of sites to ensure housing delivery and believe that sustainable urban extensions to existing main settlements including Sittingbourne and Faversham should form an integral part of the strategy. Land at Ufton Court Farm, Sittingbourne presents an opportunity to provide a residential development on the edge of the principal town in Swale. (Hallam Land Management).</p> <p>83. Land at Graveney Road) could fall within a number of spatial options, notably 1, 2, and 4, and therefore has the flexibility to accord with the Council's preferred strategy, once decided. The Site is of a scale and in a location that means it could come forward separately and in the first 5-years to bridge the gap between the start of the plan period and</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>the delivery of a larger new settlement(s) that would take time to come forward given likely infrastructure requirements. If existing allocated sites are unlikely to come forward for the use they were allocated for (i.e Land at Graveney Road), and are instead allocated for residential use then a lower number from new sites would need to be identified. (The Prudential Assurance Company).</p> <p>84. The levels of housing growth which the new Local Plan will be expected to deliver is greater than that which has historically been achieved within the Borough. It is therefore submitted that a flexible approach is needed to meet future growth which comprises a mix of the spatial alternatives identified within the Looking Ahead document.</p> <p>85. The focusing of growth towards a specific location, such as a new settlement represents a logical solution to achieving a high level of growth although unlikely to be capable of delivering housing in the short term. It therefore needs to be combined with other alternatives, and given the level of growth which needs to be achieved that should comprise growth at larger existing settlements, identifying key settlements in sustainable locations, and dispersing rural growth across a wide range of villages.</p> <p>86. In particular, in the context of the promotion of the site in question at Warden, the dispersing of rural growth across a wide range of villages is considered to represent an important element of the growth strategy for the borough. It will allow for an appropriate level of growth on smaller sites in rural areas which are suitable for the infrastructure available in the villages throughout the Swale area. The inclusion of smaller sites will allow those to be delivered by small and medium sized enterprises, which will assist with the rates of housing delivery as set out in the NPPF. (Owners of Land at Warden).</p> <p>87. Any reasonable option should be considered but sometimes it may not be possible to deliver a level of housing without unacceptable detrimental effect. Large scale house building on green field land is a</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>permanent destruction of the environment.</p> <p>88. The existing infrastructure is inadequate and there are concerns that it will be in place when needed.</p> <p>89. To reiterate we are getting close to the point when we really need to consider how many houses our current infrastructure in North Kent can really sustain to an acceptable measure of success.</p> <p>90. Support for more dispersed pattern of development, not just around Sittingbourne.</p> <p>91. In considering any future spatial alternatives the implications of congestion including air quality and the impacts on habitats should be considered, including the impact upon neighbouring authorities (Maidstone Borough Council).</p> <p>92. Does not support the expansion of Sittingbourne at the scale proposed.</p> <p>93. Address transportation first before considering strategic options for additional growth.</p> <p>94. Develop where you can on brownfield sites and maintain and enhance infrastructure, particularly in rural areas.</p> <p>95. Create places where folk feel they want to be part of a community and with good infrastructure.</p> <p>96. Objects to options (1) and (5). Supports (3) "Minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land" and (4) "Focussing growth in a new settlement" although they may be mutually incompatible if the idea of "Garden Villages" suggests that these should consist of a minimum of 5000 houses (with built in infrastructure) then the figure of 9.800 probably needing to be built on greenfield sites would indicate 2 of these "Garden Villages". As the future is so unpredictable then it would be undesirable to build more that the required quota. In 20 years' time the situation can be reviewed. Incremental building with 85% directed at Sittingbourne and Sheppey would utterly destroy any of the utopian visions of the future.</p> <p>97. Maintain green gaps between villages etc.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| <p>Q43 Possible locations for new development: Unless you have advised us already via one of our previous 'calls for sites', are there any locations or sites you think would be suitable for future development? If so, where, why and what for?</p> | <p>61</p> | <p>98. All elements should be considered not just new settlements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not possible to answer without having sight of land being offered by owners. (includes Tunstall PC). 2. Brownfield sites before greenfield sites. E.g. docks on the Isle of Sheppey, Funton brick works, Faversham Creek, Oare creek side and Sheerness steel works. The Council doesn't know what brownfield sites are out there. 3. Faversham and its villages, as the majority of previous housing has been around Sittingbourne. Faversham only has 15% of growth planned for the next 20 years and can take more for housing and employment. 4. Isle of Sheppey for employment which will encourage people to live and work there. 5. No development required and no new settlements required. 6. Land at Oare Gravel Works is appropriate for residential development. The allocation should be retained and increased to approximately 510 dwellings. (Anderson Group.) 7. Land south of The Street and south-west of Colonel's Lane, Boughton for housing. The current Local Plan includes a housing allocation to the south-west of Colonel's Lane which establishes the principle of residential development in the area. It is proposed to share the access with the existing allocation and provide a mix of housing in line with the Council's strategy. The land is relatively unconstrained and would be a logical rounding off of development in this part of Boughton. Overall, it amounts to a sustainable location which is in close proximity to facilities and transport links. (Goddard Planning Consultancy.) 8. Bell Road, Sittingbourne. 9. The Swan Quay, Faversham allocation should be changed to a mix of retail, employment and housing so that development is more likely to happen. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress work on the SHLAA and SHMA to consider the type and tenure of dwellings required and the sustainability of sites submitted (both here and from the previous call for sites). • Determination of the settlement strategy. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. At the A2, from the western link to the end of Ospringe. This is a sensible prospect for housing development and is relatively sustainable. 11. Land either side of the A2 between Salter's Lane/Love Land and Brenley Corner which already have motorway access. These sites should include some business, retail, new schools, health facilities, amenity space and should include retention the retention of existing footpaths and provision of cycle ways. 12. Apart from the Peter Brett document relating to Garden Villages, of which only two in Faversham seem appropriate, none. The call for sites will reveal more. 13. Any site that is underused and would add value to the surroundings and the town as a whole. Steer away from the easy option of using farmland. 14. The area south and east of Sittingbourne and Teynham, specifically the area around Norton Ash and Norton Ash garden centre which is an opportunity to use previously developed land. Good accessibility to the services and infrastructure of surrounding towns and is not constrained like much of the borough. A mixture of development possible. 15. Don't know. 16. No comments provided that impacts on designated nature conservation sites and the Kent Downs AONB are avoided and that overall, sites with the least environmental impacts proceed. (Natural England.) 17. Foresters Lodge Farm and land, Dunkirk and Land off Canterbury Road, adjacent village hall. (OSG Architecture.) 18. The east end of Sheppey and Oare served from a new M2 junction 5A link via Faversham. 19. Not Highsted Park. The area suggested for a garden village is more like a city of 10,000+ homes which will decimate the villages of | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Tunstall, Highsted, Milstead, Bredgar, Rodmersham and Bapchild. That is not sustainable.</p> <p>20. Wellbrook Farm, Boughton. (Hobbs Parker Property Consultants.)</p> <p>21. Areas to the south of Sittingbourne are more attractive to the commercial housebuilding market. 580 hectares with a yield of 11,250 homes could be provided through the Highsted Park proposal, starting as early as 2023 and providing a steady supply throughout the new plan period. New homes, supporting uses and necessary infrastructure will bring significant wider benefits (particularly around transport issues) at no cost to the public purse by facilitating “land value capture”. Additionally, land at Bapchild between the A2 and existing northern relief road which could facilitate the Council’s long-held aspiration for its completion. (Quinn Estates.)</p> <p>22. Land at Scocles Road, Minster. There have been consistent enquiries about this site from housing associations, care and retirement operators and house builders looking to provide a range of development which is a signal of demand and under supply in the local market. 450 to 600 units could be provided. (MLN Land and Properties.)</p> <p>23. Rushenden Marshes for the creation of either further port operations and/or new housing. Peel Port’s plans will be led by the requirement for additional port land, but if this could be met elsewhere, the site could deliver a Garden City of up to 2,700 homes. Housing plays a significant role in supporting economic growth. Garrison Point also provides an opportunity for land reclamation as part of this site. (The Peel Group.)</p> <p>24. Land north of The Street/Canterbury Road, Boughton. Approximately 70 dwellings capable of providing significant levels of affordable housing, play areas and contributions to local services. Despite previously being considered unsuitable and unachievable, the site would sit well with the existing development and would round off the</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>settlement boundary. A well thought out, landscape led scheme could promote and protect the character of this Area of High Landscape Value. The site is relatively small and promoted by a national housebuilder and so there should be little concern regarding achievability.</p> <p>25. Locations in higher value areas or where there is a track record of deliverability or where important infrastructure can be delivered as part of a strategic package (Hume Planning Consultancy.)</p> <p>26. The need for small additional numbers of housing within villages and rural communities is recognised. These should be in character to the location, proportionate to its size and should not fundamentally change the setting. (Bredgar PC.)</p> <p>27. The small triangle of land going out of Bredgar towards Tunstall just before the M2 crossing. The rectangle of land next to Bredgar village hall and possibly land behind if the owner was willing. Could allow for increased parking and a footpath through to the village shop as well as a footpath approaching the school. Neither would be significantly detrimental to the village.</p> <p>28. Although the draft revision to the NPPF suggests that higher density re-development of brownfield sites should be encouraged, it is considered that the sensitive expansion and intensification of existing settlements, supported by essential infrastructure, continues to be a sustainable approach. This should remain in the main urban centres but the needs of rural communities should also be planned for. (Altimat Property Ltd.)</p> <p>29. The Former Garden Hotel, Boughton-under-Blean. The principle of residential development here has been established through previous applications, although these have not been implemented due to viability concerns. A more expansive scheme is required to secure the restoration of the listed building. Most of the current allocations in Boughton are to the south of the settlement due to the higher valued</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>landscape to the north. This should continue. The site is capable of delivering 25-30 dwellings and would bring back a heritage asset into viable use. (Altimat Property Ltd.)</p> <p>30. Land at Fox Hill/School Lane, Bapchild. A logical and proportionate extension to Bapchild. Mixed use development of housing, retail and community provision. The allocation would address the policy issues raised in the recent refusal on the site in relation to development in a countryside location and countryside gap designation. It would also consider capacity of the A2 and general highways implications, the location of a southern relief road (particularly important), minerals and agriculture land resources, retail impacts and heritage assets. The previous wastewater issue can now be overcome and there are no overriding environmental constraints. It would be deliverable early in the Plan period. (DHA Planning.)</p> <p>31. Highsted Park and housing schemes around Kent Science Park or along a convoluted A2/M2 link road south of Sittingbourne are not suitable or sustainable. (The Five Parishes Group and Rodmersham PC.)</p> <p>32. The old economic insurance building on the A2, redundant garages on the A2 Bapchild, the Milton Creek area, old garden nurseries and Artlab office, Oad Street, the High Street upper floors. The land in the perimeter of KSP could be used for housing but the infrastructure needs to be in place first. Who is going to profit from the building? Accountability must be transparent.</p> <p>33. Land at Canterbury Road, Dunkirk has the potential for 25 self-build dwellings. There is considerable demand for this locally and it will form an important element of future housing delivery in the Borough. The proposal will take advantage of an established landscape setting, in proximity to existing dwellings and commercial development. It is in a sustainable location with immediate access to regular public transport services between Canterbury and Faversham and direct access to the</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>A2. It will support local facilities and services in the village. (Quinn Estates.)</p> <p>34. Swale BC acknowledges the challenges faced and sets out a range of potential alternatives for meeting development needs in the future. These should all be considered as part of the preparation of a new local plan provided that the objectively assessed needs are planned for with the allocation of additional sites for new housing and development. Whilst minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land should be encouraged, this would depend on the availability of appropriate sites. (S.W Attwood & Partners.)</p> <p>35. Land east of Queenborough presents a logical and sustainable location for new housing provision and could provide around 600 dwellings. A sizeable portion would be retained for green space and footpath links could be enhanced. The location offers multi-modal access, a good amount of facilities, would have limited landscape impacts and has no overriding environmental or strategic constraints. It is however acknowledged that the site is within a designated countryside gap. There is concern about the delivery rate of a new settlement whereas this site is deliverable in the shorter term. (The Crown Estate.)</p> <p>36. Land west of Warden, Sheppey offers a logical extension to the settlement of Warden while providing beneficial economic effects for east Sheppey's rural community including Leysdown which is 1.5km away. The site is not remote or isolated from existing development and there are bus routes nearby. It could provide 30 dwellings, but with the opportunity for more considering the growth needs. The site is free from overriding environmental constraints and would be deliverable early within the Plan period. (DHA Planning.)</p> <p>37. Land at Newington Industrial Estate and land to the west of Western Link. (W.T Lamb Holdings Ltd.)</p> <p>38. Crown Quay Lane.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>39. The following sites would be suitable for the implementation of 'dispersed rural growth': land to the north of The Vallance, Lynsted and land to the west of The Street, Lynsted. Both about the built up area boundary and would provide a mix of housing. The sites are available and achievable and ideally located to accommodate sensitively designed village homes with green space, amenity space and an enhanced landscape. (Kember Loudon Williams.)</p> <p>40. Sittingbourne, Newington and Upchurch. (Glandman Developments.)</p> <p>41. Land between Sittingbourne and Faversham.</p> <p>42. Hartlip.</p> | |
| <p>Q44 Models for delivering new settlements: If new communities are to be taken forward, what models for their funding, delivery and stewardship should be considered?</p> | <p>43</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure must be fully funded/in place ahead of development. Ideally such infrastructure should also be for the benefit of Swale as well. 2. Consider master developer model (inc. Tunstall PC). 3. Consider Community Development Corporation (inc. Tunstall PC). 4. Communities need to see the benefits of new settlements. 5. Garden community concept would not apply to areas between Sittingbourne and villages. 6. SBC must keep control of development so they are not isolated. Should not allow local authorities to take control. Neighbouring areas must be transparently involved in their set up, growth and planning (inc. Tunstall PC). 7. Need to control greed of developers and landowners. 8. Depends on size and ownership. If a large developer then a memorandum of understanding should be progressed with a local community steering group. 9. No skills locally to set up Development Corporation, but Community Land Trusts could get involved on parts of sites. 10. Faversham site is urban extension so how is it to be planned to support the town? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing research and discussions on models for delivery. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Such communities bring many social problems. 12. Must have CIL and new communities are too big a task for Swale. Danger of project being taken out of their jurisdiction. 13. Detrimental environmental and infrastructure problems would occur. 14. Learn from the past. 15. Planning decisions must remain in the hands of the Council. 16. Borrow money and build houses rather than rely on developers. 17. Green infrastructure, mitigation and net gain should all be subject to long term management (Natural England). 18. All options outlined should be considered. 19. Should be Government funded with profit to exchequer. 20. Is premature as NPPF not finalised. 21. Should be driven by delivery and scale so that a range of approaches can be used (Quinn Estates). 22. Use statutory development corporations, facilitated by Community Land Trusts (Newington PC). 23. May not be possible for Council to deliver all of assessed need due to constraints. Duty to Co-operate must also be fully explored. Must consider impacts that will arise close to the Swale SPA or functionally linked habitats (RSPB). 24. SBC to supervise alongside local communities, including parishes (Bredgar PC)s. 25. It's set up must not isolate it from Swale Borough Council or the neighbouring parishes or town. These neighbouring bodies must be able to influence its set up, growth, planning decisions, and politics. Swale/local authorities are not competent developers and should not be developing new towns/villages. SBC has no experience in developing land/property and private sector has not been reliable. New communities must held in public ownership/stewardship with significant and majority control by local residents and communities - Community Land Trusts. This would capture the most land value and | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>potentially be able to deliver the most infrastructure and they would be responsible for their on-going stewardship (inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC).</p> <p>26. Such projects fail to produce sustainable communities e.g. Iwade and estate shopping parades which fail. People always return to the bigger picture.</p> <p>27. Too early to prescribe model. Caution any approach that appears burdensome on landowner (Gladman Developments).</p> <p>28. Put it to the vote.</p> <p>29. None, as you don't need to take new communities forward.</p> <p>30. Only the current system should be used, but more effectively with stronger enforcement.</p> <p>31. Developers will not work in best interests of the community.</p> <p>32. Swale does not have same benefits as Ebbsfleet and thus such schemes would pressurise infrastructure and environment.</p> <p>33. A big marketing sell, an easy road to hell/nowhere.</p> <p>34. Could lead to CPO of land leaving the countryside and rural communities vulnerable.</p> <p>35. Options are very expensive and won't create affordable housing, just expensive ones for London migration.</p> | |
| <p>Q45 New settlements: Should the Council consider the opportunities offered by new settlements, in particular those which have had regard to 'garden'</p> | <p>92</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could be considered, but only in accordance with Govt. legislation as discrete settlements not as an extension of existing settlement (inc. Tunstall PC, Five Parishes). 2. Comments on specific Duchy proposals at Faversham – elitist development, with no children playing. 3. Master developer model may allow speedier development. 4. Will not generate enforceable standards and reduce this area to a brick and concrete agglomeration. 5. Not in south Sittingbourne, loss of agricultural land (food security), village character, congestion, overstretched services, destroy land of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to undertake investigation of new communities. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| <p>community principles? If no, explain why. If yes, please explain why and where they should be promoted and at what scale.</p> | | <p>high landscape value/AONB and important 'lung' for Sittingbourne, new roads would give pressure for more development on east side, water shortages (inc. Sittingbourne Society).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In principal, but there is no area in Swale suitable for them once designations, water and profit requirements are taken into account. Also loss of agricultural land, impacts on infrastructure, air quality, rail and health services etc. (Bredgar PC). 7. All sites required to give choice. Other sites should be considered first to meet short to medium term needs (inc. Hume Planning Consultancy, Gladman Developments). 8. Could consider new settlements, but would not be appropriate within AONB and less constrained areas outside would still be within its setting. Development here may not meet NPPF tests for AONB (Kent Downs AONB). 9. It is the way to go, but not in SE Sittingbourne. 10. Must be controlled by the Council via the Local Plan. 11. Planning intentions of Swale bear no relations to Ebenezer Howard, more akin to irresponsible urban sprawl (Milstead PC). 12. Ideas do not meet the criteria set out by Govt. Housing is not for local need, neither is it centred on proper public transport links. Currently all are urban extensions (inc. Five Parishes Group, Rodmersham PC). 13. Should not put all eggs in one basket as delay could undermine whole LP. 14. Fails to meet Government criteria for settlements to use previously developed land (Five Parishes Group). 15. We do not want to get ahead of the housing numbers game (Five Parishes Group). 16. London should find its own space for residents (inc. Sittingbourne Society). 17. Not convinced about deliverability of new settlements and whether they could maintain levels of growth over the plan period (The Crown | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Estate).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Should plan for majority of growth around existing settlement hierarchy (Altimat). 19. All options should be considered (SW Attwood and Partners). 20. Should not be on Sheppey as this would prejudice existing regeneration programmes (MLN Land and Properties). 21. Supports TCPA principles, but two may give concern in Swale context: (i) land value capture and (ii) community ownership of land as some land might need to be retained by developers e.g. SuDs. Pragmatic approach needed (Quinn Estates). 22. Supports new settlements, land south of M2 at Faversham would be suitable and more straightforward than other options (Owners of land Ashford Road, Faversham). 23. Consider, but refuse. Get existing settlements sorted first and send housing and jobs to the north. 24. No, unless brownfield site can be found, other land will be blighted for years. Smaller sites more manageable. 25. Won't be of any benefit to existing residents. 26. Don't know. 27. Statement about being separated from settlements but functioning in a way as to support the main settlement is contradictory. 28. Fraudulent term, they are housing estates tacked onto already creaking infrastructure and are because of uncontrolled immigration pursued by Govt. since 1997. 29. M2 at Faversham should be the boundary of town, with land to the south incorporated into AONB. 30. Yes, but make best use of USP – Rail connections. Should consider a visualisation of proposals so as to make it easier to understand. 31. Should not be a Sittingbourne V Faversham debate. 32. Look at www.gardencitiesinstitute.com. 33. Quinns is not the way forward for achieving a garden community. | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>34. Council needs to collectively own the process in taking it forward.</p> <p>35. It would defocus attention on the three main towns.</p> <p>36. New settlements mean higher housing numbers, should tell Government 'no'.</p> <p>37. Make residency a requirement in high value London homes and penalise/prevent foreign investment in properties.</p> <p>38. West Malling Airfield has had all sorts of problems.</p> <p>39. Not supported by draft NPPF.</p> <p>40. Most are on brownfield sites – airfields, racecourses.</p> <p>41. On land away from Swale.</p> <p>42. Walderslade does not work.</p> <p>43. Is easy route because Sheppey and Sittingbourne are third world towns.</p> <p>44. Already thousands of houses being built at Ebbsfleet, surely Swale schemes would be too close?</p> <p>45. Houses close to the AONB on A251 would spoil area and create too much traffic. Scheme adjacent Faversham is more realistic.</p> <p>46. Could consider scheme at Sittingbourne/Teynham if it reduces traffic on the A2.</p> <p>47. Gives scant regard to air quality issues.</p> <p>48. Comments relating to PBA work and Duchy publications as opposed to Looking Ahead.</p> <p>49. Why are specific locations being considered at this stage?</p> <p>50. Why is one set of landscape designations superior to others and why is the green area where most people live considered less worthy of consideration?</p> <p>51. Improvements at Brenley Corner could have impacts on where people want to live.</p> <p>52. Selling Station has untapped potential.</p> <p>53. Brenley is an ideal location, linked to hub at Graveney (inc. Newington PC).</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>54. Communities should be at maximum of 100 houses each, with each a quarter of a mile apart along a spine road leading to the main town. Fields can be farmed between, but parks and woodland made available where this is not possible.</p> <p>55. Faversham's heritage should not be damaged if they are to be considered.</p> <p>56. Provide on Sheppey where there is the greatest need.</p> <p>57. Yes, on poorer greenfields with new access to A2 and M2, also at Faversham and on Sheppey.</p> <p>58. Yes, the capacity of existing communities and infrastructure has been far exceeded.</p> <p>59. SBC model goes against the principle of garden villages by building on green belt between towns and villages, thereby creating urban sprawl.</p> | |
| <p>Q46 Any other comments: Are there any other matters not covered by any of the other questions in this document that you would like to tell as about?</p> | <p>65</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roads in the Sittingbourne area are already congested at peak times, particularly the A249, town centre and retail park. The proposed improvements will only alleviate the current situation. Traffic has increased dramatically over the years due to the Science Park, the school run and the local routes to the A249 and beyond. The Southern Relief Road has been rejected by an independent government inspector and now more traffic is proposed. The building of 10,000 new houses in Sittingbourne would add double, if not more, traffic. 2. Local roads are clogged with cars due to insufficient parking spaces and town centre parking is at a premium at peak times. 3. A message should be sent to government that their demands are contradictory in terms of environmental protection versus increased housing targets. 4. Pollution is bad due to the traffic, parking, areas with traffic lights instead of roundabouts, the school run and extra houses would add to this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the points raised here are repeated in other questions and will be covered by the various pieces of evidence base. |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Public transport is woeful. There are insufficient buses, which run late because of traffic problems. The town centre 'bus station' behind the Forum cannot cope at present. Trains are often full leaving Sittingbourne with people standing. 6. Schools are over full and no new schools having been built to cater for recent housebuilding which increases car travel, parking problems and pollution further. 7. Health care is an increasing problem with insufficient doctors. The extra pressure on Medway would be intolerable. 8. Infrastructure and utilities in general need urgently looking at, particularly with huge developments. 9. The countryside is being built over and will soon be confined to history. 10. There is no provision for sport facilities. 11. The questionnaire is not user friendly and has been made as difficult to respond to as possible. It will cut off a proportion of the community who would love to comment. There is uneasiness about the document and the KALC have been spoken to regarding its validity and usefulness. It has been designed not to allow true freedom of opinion and includes leading questions; dead ends and outdated management tools (SWOT) that any management consultancy prepared to spend taxpayer's money on should be disregarded for. 12. Contrary to the recently published SCI, the public is not being given a real opportunity to respond to the consultation. The pre-amble to the questions is too generalised and not specific to the needs of Swale residents. Perhaps our answers will be used to strengthen the evidence for the Council's or developer's case rather than that of the residents. Has the Leader or Deputy Leader considered meeting with the supporters of BRAD and engaged in meaningful discussion surrounding the proposed development in Wises Lane? If not, why not? The group is a true cross-section of people and yet the Council | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>has not even tried to engage despite the recommendation for this in your Statement of Community Involvement 2018.</p> <p>13. The ability of people to cope with the online portal has been underestimated, which is confusing, complex and time consuming. The general view is that this has been intentional to dissuade people from replying so that responses can be skewed to suit the pre-determined outcome. It is a sad indictment of the Council and means that people have well and truly lost faith in it.</p> <p>14. You have not covered how the bribery act will be monitored, implemented and disclosed should any one of the proposed schemes proceed.</p> <p>15. You have not referenced or sourced the information in a satisfactory manner which raises the question of collusion.</p> <p>16. Build on brownfield sites before greenfield sites (incl. agricultural land which needs to be preserved).</p> <p>17. The complexity of the questionnaire makes it inaccessible to a great number of Swale residents and individual views will not be accurately reflected and the consultation will be non-representative. The questions are poorly worded and the corresponding document does not tally or relate to every question. We believe that few members of the public will actually respond therefore it will fail in its purpose. The short questionnaire is anonymous and therefore open to abuse as a means of collecting views. (Bredgar PC, Tunstall PC and The Five Parishes Group)</p> <p>18. Water quality issues – diffuse and point source pollution. Target to reduce nutrients in freshwater streams caused mainly by agricultural run-off. Reduce agricultural and diffuse pollution sources. Historical problems in the estuary with modifications and residues from chemicals including anti-fouling paint. Conflicting recreational, development and access issues. Population growth. Tidal Thames heavily trafficked by shipping. Invasive species. Some parts of</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>catchment heavily modified for industrial or transport use. (Environment Agency.)</p> <p>19. The populous in general will be unable to associate with most of the questions in this questionnaire and will not be able to give an informed opinion. This amounts to democratic strangulation of the residents of Swale. We feel this document is biased to an outcome that is preferred by SBC. This document flies in the face of the civil rights of the people to contribute not only to their future but to the future of their families. (Milstead PC.)</p> <p>20. This consultation has been unduly complicated and the documents simply do not tally; Looking Ahead questions actually start with question 3. Questions 1 & 2 aren't questions they are personal information on a separate form and the document is called 'Notices and Permissions' and nowhere in this document does it does refer to being either questions 1 or 2. This is confusing and potentially respondents could find their comments are excluded from the consultation if they fail to return this information. We have had many complaints about not only about the consultation but also about the portal. Residents have got so fed up trying to use it they've resorted to old fashion letters and submitting by hand or by email. Surely this then defeats the whole purpose of the online portal? This consultation has been nothing short of a fiasco; made overly complicated, littered with errors, obtuse and difficult to submit. Yesterday our Chairman had at least 10 people come up to her at our annual jazz event on the village green to say they could not submit their responses either Thursday, Friday or indeed over the weekend! I've also had many phone calls saying the same thing. We believe the Council has left itself wide open to fraud by allowing anonymous responses to the short questionnaire. (Rodmersham PC.)</p> <p>21. There are challenges ahead but with scope for significant, high quality and transformational growth. Location and infrastructure</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>improvements will be key. As well as opportunities to the south-east of Sittingbourne, there are also those in the surrounding towns and rural areas. New settlements may well play a role in the longer term, but we would urge caution in the Council relying on significant delivery from them over the Local Plan period. Funding and delivery mechanisms should be well thought out as these have been seen to be contentious elsewhere. (Gladman Developments.)</p> <p>22. It appears the Swale BC is too closely associated with a specific developer and most of the consultation is directly worded to support their aspirations, rather than that of Swale residents. You would also appear to want responses to unknown policies that have yet to be confirmed. The 'garden city' proposal bears no resemblance to actual policy or to the extent of actual principles, rather than creating an urban extension of Sittingbourne at the decimation of parts of our Borough which I do not support. You should have waited until the new NPPF was formalised. This is not a proper consultation rather than the ideas of SBC for the next 40+ years. The expansion of housing should be reconsidered until it can be done in a sustainable way.</p> <p>23. Get a better hall for public consultations at Swale House, as the last one I attended was too small, you could not hear or see what was going on.</p> <p>24. Sheppey shouldn't be disregarded as per the Peter Brett analysis and should be made more desirable and economically viable. The desirability issue on Sheppey is understood but surely there is good opportunity for affordable homes here. The port is important to industry and job creation. Add to this improved rail links and Sheppey would begin to lose its downmarket reputation.</p> <p>25. Faversham seems to have escaped housing allocation in the current Local Plan but is well placed for expansion outside the old town.</p> <p>26. Industrial, warehouse and distribution should be adjacent to junction 5A. Infrastructure is key to future development.</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>27. Many believe responding to the consultation to be a waste of time as the decision to build the “garden city” has already been made. It feels as if this is a formality to tick the proverbial boxes of the planning department.</p> <p>28. The impression is that the profit for developers is more important to the Council than the views of the people. If this is to change then more consideration needs to be given to people who will be directly affected by the current local plan and its forthcoming revisions.</p> <p>29. Adopting the garden plan approach would help make a very difficult problem of providing more houses easier for everyone to accept, however thought should be given to placing facilities in areas where you will have to use a car to access them. E.g. the school in Tunstall.</p> <p>30. Would like to know about developments on Roman Burial Grounds as I believe these are not permitted.</p> <p>31. Remove Wises Lane from the Local Plan as housing numbers are reached and there is no need for it.</p> <p>32. The government needs to be told to sit down and work out how it is going to cope with out of control population growth. It, and this plan, will not be sustainable.</p> <p>33. The worst questionnaire I have ever completed, and the shorter one is worthless.</p> <p>34. Lack of consideration for those wishing to downsize into bungalows.</p> <p>35. Lack of acknowledgement of the role that our historic churches play in the communities.</p> <p>36. We already have a Local Plan adopted by the inspector which has cost a great deal of money. We should only review the concerns of the inspector on road links and continue with this plan. Any new proposals may not be adopted by the inspector and will waste even more tax payers’ money. The improved M2 Junction 5/A249 would be the major road improvement. More localised small improvements could then be considered. We have many years before a review is due – why</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>reviewing now? This development will decimate the south of Sittingbourne, small blocks of development I understand but 10,000 homes is beyond belief.</p> <p>37. The assumption has been made that Government will impose increased housing targets on us, but what if they don't this could change the future plans.</p> <p>38. What influence do councils have on Government? How can the message be put across that demands regarding the size of development against environmental considerations are in major conflict.</p> <p>39. Would it be possible to do more with the old quay in Sittingbourne as part of its regeneration? It is essential to avoid the planning mistakes of the past such as the Forum and existing housing estates.</p> <p>40. Objection to the proposal for a motorway junction and 10,000+ houses to the south east of Sittingbourne over prime agricultural land, orchards, and essentially joining villages up to Sittingbourne to completely alter the landscape. At the final discussions of Bearing Fruits a new junction 5a with the M2 did not have support from Highways England and the Planning Inspector did not include it in the final draft. To conjure up a new Local Plan seemingly with the express purpose of trying to push these plans through is morally wrong. To ask landowners to come forward with plans when these plans have already been drawn up is scandalous. Sustainability of new houses should include not only transport by road by road but also rail, with access to medical facilities. There is currently a deficit in NHS funding for the Swale. Impact upon protected woods, i.e. Cromer woods.</p> <p>41. Make developers have long term responsibility for what they produce – a lifetime guarantee, rather than a 2 year warranty, for things such as infrastructure, pollution. This will make them build real quality. Bind them in with rewards and penalties in a long-term 'reverse PFI' style partnership. Better results for Swale and the developers will still make</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>a profit.</p> <p>42. Not enough proposed development around Faversham or Upchurch and other areas away from Sittingbourne. The proposed upgrade of Key Street and M2 J5 show a lack of common sense and the result will be more traffic during and after the works. The area has become a dumping ground from London, which is not being fought by the MPs. Inspectors at local, county and national level have been more concerned with protecting Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells and West Kent in general for many years.</p> <p>43. Parish Council should have more input. There is little in the Plan beyond housing. First priority must be the planet. After Brexit we may need to be more self-sufficient and Grade 1 agricultural land must be preserved. The young population need to be engaged. Secondary Schools should have the opportunity to know the heritage of the town and how to preserve it.</p> <p>44. SBC appears to be unable of accepting the Inspector's final report (on the current Plan). Soon after adopting Bearing Fruits, the Council was already in negotiations with a certain developer regarding the expansion of Kent Science Park which would not amount to a Garden City but an urban extension of Sittingbourne. Delivery is already an issue. By having a development order plan in place, setting out when developers expect to start and finish, there will be less disruption to the highway network and other essential services. Much stronger control over development in the borough is required as part of the review. Suggesting that the Plan is unsound beyond 2022 is unhelpful and unfair to the Planning Inspectorate and serves to encourage developers to use this against you. There is an adopted Local Plan with an end date of 2031. The review was to liaise with Highways England over the additional sites required. It was not a way to force through more development or create a new plan. This is based on future alterations to the NPPF and the review should have waited for</p> | |

| Looking Ahead Questions | Number of respondents | Summary of responses | Potential local plan actions to be taken forward for further consideration |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>this to have been published.</p> <p>45. Planners should encourage co-operation between the developers of the two potential development sites on either side of the A2 approaching Brenley Corner. Industrial employment is and will remain fundamental to the prosperity of the town, employment and to the character of Faversham, which the Faversham Society strongly supports. Planners should look at opportunities to relieve traffic pressure on Faversham by re-thinking the location of industry. There is the opportunity to rebalance this if sites become available to the south and east of the town which would be closer to the motorway. Currently it is located in the north and west.</p> <p>46. Loss of habitat for birds, insects and mammals.</p> | |