

STA055



COBHAM PARISH
COUNCIL

06 NOV 2007

3rd November 2007

Re Gravesham Local Development Framework

Core Strategy Key Issues and Options

To Whom It May Concern:

I enclose the form Regarding the Local Development framework which was completed by Dr Nigel Haig after consultation and on behalf of members of Cobham Parish Council.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jill Beety".

Jill Beety
Clerk to Cobham Parish Council

pp Dr Nigel D Haig, Chairman of Planning Committee, Cobham Parish Council

**Local Development Framework Regulation 25
Consultation on:
Core Strategy Key Issues and Options**



We will accept photocopies of this form or you can download it from the Councils web site at: www.gravesham.gov.uk. The consultation document can also be viewed on the web site, at local libraries, Towncentric and Civic Centre.

You must complete part A of the form, where relevant. Representations will not be accepted without a name and address. In part B you only need respond to the questions on which you wish to make comment. Completion of Parts C and D are optional. All data you supply will be used in connection with the preparation of the Local Development Framework and no other purpose. Your name/organisation and any comments you make may be made public. Please sign and date the form on page 13.

Part A: Your details

Name:	<i>Dr N.D. Haig</i>
Address:	
Post Code:	
Organisation (if relevant):	<i>Cobham Parish Council</i>
Telephone:	
Email:	

Agent De

Firm name:	
Your name:	
Address:	
Post Code:	
Job Title:	
Telephone number:	
Email:	

Part B: Consultation Questions

The text for each topic (or sub topic) in the Core Strategy Key Issues and Options Paper sets out the key options and the Borough Councils preferred options. The questionnaire below sets out each of the key options in highly abbreviated form. Your responses should be considered on the basis of the full text NOT the abbreviated version given here. You only need respond to those questions where you wish to express a preference, simply by ticking the box on the option you prefer. Most questions require the selection of one response; a few clearly indicated allow more than one option to be selected. There is space for written comments at the end of the form.

A. Key Spatial Objectives (pages 14 – 17 of report)

Do you agree or disagree with the Key Spatial Objectives set out in the report?

	Agree	Disagree
SO 1 – Delivering the Major Development Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 2 – Employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 3 – Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 4 – Retail	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 5 – Culture, Leisure and Tourism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 6 – Community Infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 7 – Built Environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 8 – Heritage and the Historic Environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 9 – Green Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 10 – Transport and Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 11 – Climate Change and Renewable Energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 12 – Location of New Development and Management of Flood Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 13 – Water Supply and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 14 – Thames Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 15 – The Countryside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SO 16 – Rural Settlements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you disagree with any of the Key Spatial Objectives or think there should be others, please set out your comments separately at the end of the questionnaire.

#1. Delivering the Major Development Sites (pages 19 – 30 of report)

1. Where should growth be located?
 - a. Sequential approach with an emphasis on previously developed land, having regard to flood risk and public transport availability
 - b. Prioritise sites at least risk from flooding, irrespective of whether previously developed etc.
 - c. New settlement pattern by means of Green Belt boundary review NO -

2. What sort of Development should be encouraged?
 - a. Urban forms based on public transport orientated, mixed use communities
 - b. Place emphasis on car usage
3. Is it necessary to achieve a balance between housing and employment on the major sites?
 - a. Balance between housing and employment uses as in South East Plan
 - b. Housing growth given priority over employment
 - c. Employment growth given priority over housing

#2. Employment (pages 31 – 35 of report)

1. What sort of employment structure should the Borough seek?
 - a. Appropriate balance across types of jobs
 - b. Concentrate on office (B1a) employment
 - c. Concentrate on industrial/commercial (B1c/B2/B8) employment
 - d. Prioritise riverside sites for port uses

#3. Housing (Pages 37 – 43 of report)

1. What sort of housing should be developed in Gravesham?
 - a. Variety of dwelling types to meet needs and within site constraints
 - b. Increased proportion of flats/apartments
 - c. Maintain the current proportion of flats in total housing stock
2. What should be the percentage of affordable housing in the Borough?
 - a. Retain existing target of 30%
 - b. Increase target from 30% to 40%
3. Should the thresholds which apply to the target for affordable housing be lowered in the urban and rural areas?
 - a. Lowered to 0.5 ha/15 units urban; 50% on 2 or more units rural
 - b. Or introduce new single threshold
 - c. Or retain existing thresholds

#3a. Gypsies and Travellers (pages 44 - 59 of report)

Do you agree/disagree with the Objective set out on page 46 of the report?

Agree Disagree

If you disagree, please set out your reasons or proposed alterations separately at the end of the questionnaire.

1. How many permanent pitches, on the evidence set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, should the Council provide?

- a. 15 permanent pitches
- b. As above but with additional for those in permanent housing
2. Given the number of unauthorised encampments that occur annually in the Borough and that work is ongoing at a County and SEERA level to determine the level of transit pitch provision required in the Borough, should the Council?
- a. Allocate land following the completion of the KCC/SEERA work
- b. Safeguard land on the basis that some provision will be needed
3. Should the factors for assessing the suitability of the site reflect those set out in Circular 01/2006?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- If you think additional factors should be taken into consideration please make comments at the end of the questionnaire.

[For information: Circular 01/2006 can be viewed on line at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circularcommunities2> or in hard copy at the Planning Department)

4. Where should Gypsy and Traveller sites be located?
- a. Sites within the urban area and rural settlements only
- b. As above plus Green Belt sites on the edge of built up areas NO.
- c. Accessible Green Belt sites in urban fringe or next to villages
- d. In the rural area away from existing settlements
5. What type of site(s) should the Borough Council provide to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers?
- a. A number of small family sites NOT MCB
- b. A single site for many families
- #4. Retail** (pages 61 – 66 of report)
1. Where should the demand for increased retail floorspace be met?
- a. Gravesend Town Centre, edge of centre, local centres hierarchy
- b. As above but major retail role for Ebbsfleet
- c. Allow unrestricted location
2. Given its specific location requirements, where in broad terms should retail warehousing be located?
- a. The Imperial Business and Retail Park
- b. A new retail park on a major site
- c. Ad hoc permissions on sites in the urban area
- #5. Culture, Leisure and Tourism** (pages 67 – 84 of report)
1. The paper sets out a 'baseline' case focussed around the town centre and a limited role for Ebbsfleet and other transport nodes, with indoor sports and leisure focused on the Cygnet and Cascades Leisure Centres, support for certain other specialist locations or facilities such as Meopham

School and the Ebbsfleet United FC stadium, and with an increased role for tourism.

Which option do you support? You may chose 'a' as the 'baseline' case set out in the report or a variation of this by ticking any of the boxes from 'b' to 'i'.

- a. The baseline strategy as set out in the issues paper
- b. As 'a' but with location more dependent on the car
- c. As 'a' but with hotels allowed away from town centre
- d. As 'a' but with Ebbsfleet taking a more major role
- e. As 'a' with main indoor sport provision focussed on one site
- f. As 'a' but with no rural sports hub at Meopham
- g. As 'a' but no support to specialist sports provision
- h. As 'a' but no support for Ebbsfleet United
- i. As 'a' but no support for tourism development

If you support none of the above options, please set out your reasons and your proposed alternative in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

#6. Community Infrastructure (pages 86 – 97 of report)

1. Should the provision of new community infrastructure be supported?
 - a. Wide range of community facilities
 - b. Only key services
 - c. Only within major new development sites
 - d. No new provision

2. Should existing community infrastructure be protected and retained?
 - a. Loss of existing facilities will be normally resisted
 - b. Retention will be determined by operational/market forces

3. Should new community infrastructure be provided in line with major new developments?
 - a. Major new development only with adequate facilities
 - b. Major new development not dependent on facilities

4. Should proposals for major new development be required to conduct a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)?
 - a. HIA required for major sites
 - b. No HIA required

5. Where should new community facilities (e.g. schools, hospitals and post office) be located?
 - a. Community facilities at nodal transport points/local centres
 - b. Community facilities in residential areas

6. Should community facilities be encouraged as part of mixed-use development?

- a. Community facilities should be part of mixed use development
- b. New facilities not to be encouraged as part of development
7. Should school sites be expanded to create additional community uses?
- a. School facilities should be available to the whole community
- b. School facilities should remain focussed on education
8. Should new utility services be co-located with existing services?
- a. Co-location of utility services where possible
- b. No co-location
9. Should new telecommunications development and infrastructure be supported?
- a. Encouragement for full cable etc provision for whole Borough
- b. Provision concentrated in major new development
- c. No support
10. Should erection of new pylons and overhead lines be resisted and existing redundant lines removed?
- a. Resist new overhead lines and underground if feasible
- b. New pylons/overhead lines to follow line of existing
- c. New lines supported

#7. Built Environment (pages 98 – 107 of report)

1. What should the Council do to improve the overall quality of the public realm and to promote a better use of public open space? (tick all that apply)
- a. Propose a major new town square
- b. Create a number of smaller open spaces
- c. Improve existing open spaces
- d. Promote 'shared-pavements' streets rather than 'roads'
2. What kind of development and building heights would you consider to be most appropriate to fit into the image and local character of Gravesham?
- a. High rise – low coverage
- b. Low rise – high coverage
- c. Medium rise – medium coverage
3. Where would be the most appropriate locations for taller development and, in exceptional circumstances, a landmark building?
- a. At the "nodes"
- b. Along transport "corridors"
- c. Within the design scheme of large urban regeneration sites
- d. At the waterfront along the Thames at Gravesend and Northfleet
4. What land uses would you consider the most appropriate for tall and landmark buildings?

- a. Mix of office/commercial etc but non-residential
- b. Mix of office/commercial etc including residential use
- c. Mainly residential but ground floor office/commercial

#8. Heritage and Historic Environment (pages 108 – 113 of report)

1. What should the approach be to the Borough's heritage and historic environment?
 - a. Proactive use of heritage as central to regeneration
 - b. Adopt a minimalist approach compatible with legislation
 - c. Give greater priority to other objectives over heritage

#9. Green Infrastructure (Pages 114 – 123 of report)

1. What approach should the Borough Council adopt toward the provision of Green Infrastructure – i.e. open space and other such natural assets?
 - a. Reduce commitment to green infrastructure/open space etc
 - b. Continue existing policy
 - c. Champion improvements to green infrastructure/open space etc. to support regeneration of area

#10. Transport and Air Quality (pages 124 – 131 of report)

1. From the transport perspective what should the physical form of development be?
 - a. Promote public transport orientated development
 - b. Plan for private car growth
2. What should the housing / employment balance be given the transport implications from commuting?
 - a. Reduce out commuting and promote Ebbsfleet
 - b. Priority on housing growth
 - c. Priority on employment growth
3. How should the transport funding gap be addressed?
 - a. Introduction of a transport levy
 - b. Site by site negotiations on transport contributions
4. How can the management of air quality be taken forward?
 - a. Seek to minimise impact of increasing traffic levels
 - b. Apply tariff approach to generate additional funds

#10a. Town Centre Transport and Major Sites (pages 132 – 140 of report)

Do you agree/disagree with the Objective set out on page 134 of the report?

Agree Disagree

If you disagree, please set out your reasons or proposed alterations separately at the end of the questionnaire.

1. Key criteria for the future town centre transport network?
 - a. Maximise public transport access etc
 - b. Give priority to free flow on existing network
2. Transport Quarter objectives should be to?
 - a. Maximise public transport access and interchange
 - b. Allow piecemeal development and existing car parking
3. Approach to town centre car parking should be to?
 - a. Managing existing and new stock efficiently for long/short stay parking with new residential development expected to provide on average 1 parking space per dwelling.
 - b. Attempt to meet car parking demand by additional provision
 - c. Reduce car park provision, particularly long stay
4. Proposals for the Heritage Quarter should be?
 - a. Comprehensive quality mixed use development of both sites
 - b. Piecemeal development of the sites
 - c. Concentrate initially on either eastern or western site
5. On Imperial Site, proposals should seek to?
 - a. Explore options for mixed use development
 - b. Allow piecemeal development in response to market demand

#11. Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Renewable Energy (Pages 142 – 149 of report)

1. What approach should the Borough Council adopt toward the questions of climate change, sustainability and use/production of renewable energy?
 - a. Do nothing/minimum required under legislation
 - b. Adopt a proactive approach with the Borough Council taking a lead on climate change, sustainability and use/production of renewable energy.

#12. Flood Risk (pages 150 – 156 of report)

1. In terms of location of new development
 - a. Making best use of previously developed land so as to avoid fresh land take but taking into account ability to defend against flooding whilst managing residual risk
 - b. Prioritise sites least likely to flood
 - c. Emphasis on new settlement pattern

#13. Water Supply and Quality (Pages 158 – 165 of report)

1. What approach should the Borough Council adopt to questions of water supply and water quality?
 - a. Do nothing/minimum required under legislation
 - b. Adopt a proactive approach with the Borough Council taking a lead on water supply and quality issues

#14. Thames Riverside (Pages 166 – 185 of report)

This topic paper looks at the Thames Riverside on a site-by-site basis, noting that on a number of sections there is likely to be little change over the LDF period whilst others may be subject to significant change. It will be noted that there is overlap between this topic paper and other dealing with the Major Sites. The questions set out below pick up on some of the options thought to be available and a range of more detailed points.

Please select the options you agree with and make any further points in relation to any particular area in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

Please note that some questions allow for more than one choice to be made.

1. **North Kent Marshes east of Metropolitan Police Training Centre:**
 - a. Improve access and nature conservation interest
 - b. Reinstatement Thames & Medway Canal (including reinstatement of the urban section from Canal Basin to Mark Lane)
 - c. No change

2. **Denton Slipways to the Metropolitan Police Training Centre (1)**
 - a. Retain river related/commercial uses along frontage from Canal Basin along riverfront to Denton Wharf
 - b. Promote mixed use development along riverfront from Canal Basin to Denton Wharf then retain existing river related uses

3. **Denton Slipways to the Metropolitan Police Training Centre (2)**
 - a. Build a new bridge over the canal and railway to assist in regeneration and take heavy traffic out of Town Centre/ Canal Basin area
 - b. Limit development to traffic capacity of Ordnance Road junction

4. **Canal Basin Regeneration Area**

Outline planning permission for mixed use development in place. Unlikely that alternative strategic options will be available over LDF period. Potential for reinstatement of Thames and Medway Canal covered in 14(1) above.

5. **Riverside Leisure Area**

No strategic options as area is significant Town Centre related recreational site likely to be retained in such use through LDF period.

6. **Custom House/Royal Terrace Pier/PLA Offices**

No strategic options (see Town Centre)

7. **Royal Clarendon Hotel/Clarendon Lawn to Town Pier**

No strategic options (see Town Centre)

8. **Town Pier to West Street Pier**

No strategic options (see Town Centre)

9. **Baltic Wharf to Imperial Wharf**
No strategic options (see Town Centre)
10. **Landsdowne Square**
No strategic options (part of Conservation Area)
11. **Northfleet Embankment East**
- Promote mixed use redevelopment of eastern/central part of site, retaining employment uses to west at Kimberley Clark etc
 - Retain all of area in industrial use
12. **Northfleet Embankment Centre Industrial Area**
No strategic options as area likely to be retained for cement importation and other river related/industrial uses over LDF period.
13. **Northfleet Embankment West**
- Reinstate and enhance links along Ebbsfleet
 - Relocate river businesses to Swanscombe Peninsula
 - No change
14. **Swanscombe Peninsula**
- Accept relocated river related businesses
 - Enhance local access links
 - No change

#15. Countryside (pages 186 – 193 of report)

- How do we protect and enhance the countryside whilst ensuring that it remains vibrant and that people living in the rural areas have appropriate access to services?
 - Support rural diversification with small scale Green Belt release
 - Support rural diversification with larger scale Green Belt release
 - Give priority to Green Belt and other conservation policies *always*
- The current policy on extensions to residential properties in the Green Belt allows an increase of one third over original floor area. Should this allowance change?
 - Be maintained at existing level
 - Be increased
 - Be reduced
- What should the role of the urban/rural fringe in Gravesham?
 - Adopt a positive management strategy
 - Continue the current restrictive approach

#15a. Culverstone Valley Area (Pages 194 – 204 of report)

Do you agree/disagree with the Objective set out on page 197 of the report?

Agree Disagree

If you disagree, please set out your reasons or proposed alterations separately at the end of the questionnaire.

1. How should development within the Culverstone Valley Area be controlled?
 - a. Separate policy until all authorised plots are developed
 - b. Normal Green Belt policy with allowance for adequate amenities

2. If a separate policy approach is maintained should authorised caravans continue to be allowed to be replaced with a permanent dwelling?
 - a. Caravans should be treated as elsewhere in the Borough
 - b. The exceptions policy for caravans should be retained

3. If a separate policy approach is maintained, should the existing floorspace limit for replacing or extending authorised chalets be retained?
 - a. Maintain the existing floorspace limit of 92.7m²
 - b. Allow one third expansion as normal in the Green Belt
 - c. Increase the floorspace

If you consider the floorspace limit should be increased please set out your reasons in the comments section at the end of the questionnaire.

4. A number of issues have been raised in previous consultations relating to vacant plots, woodland areas and highway access in the Culverstone Valley Area. If you wish to make any comment on the Borough Council's position on these issues please make them in the comments section at the end of this questionnaire.

#16. Rural Settlements (pages 205 – 208 of report)

What should be the approach of the Council to the planning of rural settlements over the next 20 years?

- a) By continuing with existing policies, i.e. permitting infill within the existing village envelopes but no incursions into the Green Belt, except for affordable housing on small sites, where a need has been justified in a Parish Survey. *would well refer.*

- b) By reviewing village envelopes with the aim of identifying small parcels of land that may be taken into the envelope for specific forms of development.

- c) By limited extensions to village boundaries, in locations well related to public transport, where there is an identified requirement for special needs/affordable housing or community facilities and there are no suitable

sites in the village.


Any other comments?

- Are there any other strategic issues that you feel should be addressed?
- Are there any significant additional studies or other evidence that is needed?
- Whilst this consultation is about strategic options, do you wish to bring any sites to our attention that you wish to promote for development?

(If you need more space please continue on page 14 and/or use additional sheets of paper clearly marking them with your name and the topic).

Regarding SOL: It seems perverse to seek to provide jobs in order to attract more people into an already overcrowded space. The North-East wants jobs + people, so encourage them to go there, not here!

Regarding Rural Settlements: Always give priority to protection of the Green Belt. It is a thoroughly successful scheme.

Signature: 	Date: 3/11/07
--	---------------

All responses must be received by 17:00 on Tuesday 20th November 2007
Thank you for your interest

Please return to Gravesham LDF
Planning & Regeneration Services
Civic Centre
Gravesend
Kent DA12 1AU
Email: planning.policy@gravesahm.gov.uk
Telephone: 01474 33 76 03

