

Westgate on Sea Town Council response to representations on the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan

Introduction

Between 24th September 2021 and 25th November 2021, a Regulation 14 survey was carried out as part of the Westgate-on-Sea Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan consultation and engagement process.

The survey was open to local residents, businesses and other relevant parties and stakeholders to take part in.

Responders were presented with summaries of each of the Neighbourhood Plan's proposed themes and asked to say whether they supported or objected to each theme, and whether they wished to comment further on each theme. Responders were also asked to provide demographic and classification data, including age band, address and postcode for where they live, for statistical and analytical purposes.

Due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions during the period in which the survey was carried out, the primary focus was on getting responses to the digital version of the survey, however paper copies were made available.

The survey was heavily promoted on the Town Council's social media and its website. Westgate-on-Sea Town Council also made use of paid-for social media advertising via Instagram and Facebook, geo-targeting residents who identify as living within the geographic area covering the council, inviting them to complete the survey.

A leaflet was also dropped through doors across the town, in order to build awareness of the Neighbourhood Plan and encourage residents to take part in the consultation.

326 representations were received in total. These representations were numbered 6-331 on an excel spreadsheet (rows 1-5 did not include comments)

People had the opportunity to respond as follows to each comment:

Support, Object, I wish to add something (Omission), or not respond to that theme.

Theme 1 Design:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331

Summary:

There was a strong support from residents, regarding the themes to maintain the character, uniqueness and personality of WoS. Over a third of resident respondents are content with the character of the town, feeling the need to preserve it for future generations. There was a strong support for the design policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

25, 38, 66, 84, 113, 177, 182, 205, 231, 236, 252, 271, 275, 296, 311, 316

Summary and Response:

25, 38, 66, 205, 316- Westgate doesn't need any more building, overbuilding destroys the character of our town and our seafront is great as it is

177- Stop stopping progress, evolution is inevitable

182- Should use infill plots first

271- more important problems need addressing first

231- Comments - Part of 10.2 requires that the "density of new development should be in keeping with the "Character Area". As Character Area is capitalised this should refer to a previously defined Character Area earlier in the document. These should either be defined or worded to allow for individual assessment. We suggest this is amended to read "the density of new development should be in keeping with the character of the area". A

further element of 10.2 states that "Development should not impact on surrounding properties". This should be slightly reworded, as all development will impact to some degree on surrounding properties by its simple existence. To require no impact at all is not appropriate. We suggest that this is amended to read "Development should not adversely impact on surrounding properties".

84, 113, 236, 252, 275, 296, 311- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 25, 38, 66, 205, 316, 177, 182, 271 The timing of the consultation coincided with the submission of a hybrid outline planning application for 2000 homes on agriculture land on the outskirts of WoS, this planning application has been opposed by a large number of the community. It is considered that the representations to the NP are a response to the planning application rather than the NP specifically. This is because the representations are not objecting to the policy or theme directly. WoSTC has considered the planning application at length and is continuously keeping this under review, there is a dedicated section on the WoSTC website which includes further details and the work undertaken to date. [Proposed 2000 Houses - Westgate-on-Sea Town Council - Westgate-on-Sea Town Council, Westgate-On-Sea \(westgateonsea.gov.uk\)](#) WoSTC takes onboard the strength of feeling regarding the planning application and does support the use of infill plots first before building on agricultural land. But considers that there are no changes required to Theme 1 in light of these comments.

Comment 231 Agree that the bullet points on page 24 should be amended as follows "•The density of new development should be in keeping with the ~~Character Area~~ character of the area and any relevant Conservation Areas". Also amend text on page 22 as following, "It is essential that new building work throughout the Neighbourhood Development Plan Area protects and enhances this heritage and this applies outside of the conservation area. In these areas design of development should be in keeping with the character of the area." Agree that the bullet point (page23) should be changed to "Development should not adversely impact on surrounding properties but should seek to maintain privacy and alleviate possible noise issues to existing neighbouring properties as well as seek to lessen its impact on the surrounding area."

I wish to add something (Omission)

60, 67, 86, 106, 126, 134, 139, 148, 163, 188, 200, 215, 225, 234, 259, 332, 333

Summary and Response

60- The design theme needs to include the needs of young and old people not just aesthetics.

86, 188- I don't agree we need to keep the same styles, contemporary design can leave a legacy too. Recognition needs to be given to innovative, quality design that may not necessarily be in character but would nonetheless enhance the area and build on the existing character.

163- Building character is open to interpretation

225-As long as the Conservation Area is protected

67- Propose that more pictures are provided to show what it looks like.

106- There is no continuity at the moment.

139- Some of the flats that have been built have been designed to reflect the character.

234- No new homes should be built

134- Green spaces should have been protected before this plan

148- We aren't sure where new developments may arise on the seafront

126- We need to replace the poor inefficient dwellings of the past with new energy efficient dwellings.

215- Theme of sustainability and green infrastructure should run through all themes.

200- I object to the kiosk on Westgate Bay

332- WSNP1 - Chapter 11 of the NPPF requires substantial weight to be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes, and supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if it would help to meet identified needs for housing (para 120 c) and d). This policy is therefore contrary to the NPPF. WSNP2 - The character and design requirements mentioned in the text could be included in the policy to give it more weight."

333- Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: It is recommended that consideration is given to the fact that any increase in households requires a proportionate increase in sustainable infrastructure provision, commensurate with the profile of the occupants. WSNP2 - The County Council is supportive of the objection of promoting quality design in the built environment - including design that improves energy efficiency and renewable energy. KCC is in the process of developing the Kent Design Guide (to which a current consultation is being undertaken) in order to promote the principles of quality design in new development and reference to this document is recommended.

259- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 60, 86, 188, 163, 225, 67, 106, 139, 134, 148, 234 The design policies have been written to reflect the views of the community based on the response to the original public survey and consultation, which specifically highlighted the desire to keep the heritage as character as currently reflected by the streetscape. Although WoSTC notes the comments regarding modern architecture it is considered that the strength of support for the theme and policies, as written, outweigh the requests to alter the drafting of the NP.

Comments 126 and 215 WoSTC acknowledges that buildings should become more efficient and sustainable to ensure they're fit-for-purpose and to enable their longevity and reflective response to climate change and this is reflected in Theme 4 of the NP. However, it is considered that this policy as written does

not prevent retrofitting of heritage buildings with renewable technology or better insulation. Appropriate legislation and guidance is in place to support heritage buildings to become more energy efficient and the local heritage policies and Historic England are considered the 'go-to' advice in this respect. No changes are required in the drafting of the NP.

Comment 200 *The management of the licensee and the provision of the kiosk on Westgate Bay is out of the scope of the NP*

Comment 332 *Redraft policy WSNP1 as follows "The redevelopment of the West Zone of Sea Road, for the purpose of building flats, will not be supported, where it creates over massing, development forward of the neighbourly building line, and it is in discord with the prevailing character."*

Comment 333: *KCC's comments are noted. Any additional infrastructure will be established at the planning application stage through Thanet District Council.*

Didn't respond to this theme

27, 36, 41, 43, 97, 107, 111, 121, 183, 189, 218

Theme 2 Economy:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 279, 281, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330

Summary:

There was a general support for the services provided by the town and the support provided to sustain the shopping areas and businesses in the long-term.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

66, 76, 84, 121, 167, 177, 205, 236, 238, 246, 255, 280, 296, 331

Summary and Response:

66, 280- The shops that are there are falling apart and many are empty. How about supporting the shops that are already there and getting the buildings already built occupied? homes rather than boarded up shops

167- I object putting tourists first before local residents who pay council tax

121, 177, 331- AirBnBs are the major reason for the shortage in housing. Homes for locals first.

238- I feel that Westgate's charm is the peace and old seaside town character. This will be ruined by becoming a niche visitor attraction.

246- object to more hotels and b&b's

205- If Westgate is going to be flooded with new residents because of new housing then the economical plan is to serve the rapid population growth due to this decision and not to support local already established businesses

76, 84, 236, 255, 296- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 66, 280- It is noted that that several commercial units have become vacant in recent years, although they are often rented by 3-4 months, and that there need to be a balance with the current high demand for residential accommodation. However, there is a strong strength of feeling that the central shopping area should be retained wherever possible. On this basis, the WoSTC will update the policy to add flexibility, which could enable the change of use of commercial units to residential on the periphery of the shopping area and specifically where units may be more prone to longer periods of vacancy.

Redraft the last sentence of policy WSNP4 as follows "...Class C3 (Residential) will only be supported at first floor level and above, or on the periphery of the shopping area, where change of use to residential may be acceptable on the ground floor and above."

Comments 167, 121, 177, 331, 238, 246 Although there is an identified concern that the promotion of tourism to the WoS could have a detrimental impact on character, the economic benefits of the visitor economy do outweigh any concern, especially regarding visitor spend locally and the additional employment opportunities that this service economy brings, cleaners of accommodation through to restaurants. The positives born from tourism does mean that a balance has to be made to provide services and places for visitors to stay. There use of Airbnb's is one element of this visitor offering that has been raised by several of the representations, specifically the concern that they remove residences from the housing stock. As planning permission is not

necessarily required to run an Air BnB, it would be difficult to restrict their provision or use through the NP. However, it does seem important to acknowledge their input to the visitor economy.

Redraft the second sentence on page 25 to read- "These include the cafes and restaurants along the seafront and in the town, visitor accommodation including guest houses, B&B and Airbnb's, as well as the extremely popular cinema.

Comment 205 New residents of potential new housing developments will help to support the economy. Any new facilities required as a result of the increase in population will be planned at the strategic level through the Local Plan and the district level planning process. It is not for the NP to install new facilities, although the policies contained within it will support the provision of services where required.

I wish to add something (Omission)

16, 22, 45, 59, 60, 72, 86, 87, 126, 140, 148, 154, 163, 168, 188, 196, 199, 215, 239, 242, 259, 261, 270, 284, 290, 295, 315, 332, 333

Summary and Response:

16, 126, 162, 242- a shop converted to a home is better than boarded up or another charity shop. Housing is necessary for the younger generation. If a property has been derelict for a set period (say 5 years) and all efforts to support its re-opening as retail have been exhausted then it should be considered for housing. Brownfield site is more environmentally friendly than greenfield site

148- The theme needs to be divided- Hotels/B&B's and shopping

45- We have enough coffee shops/cafes already

60- Digital connectivity should be included and access to flexible workspace and social meeting spaces. Having a train station should be taken advantage of for business visits and ensure that trains stop more frequently

87- Westgate needs a supermarket. This will stop unnecessary car trips to sites elsewhere.

154- Encourage small, independent businesses for the shop spaces, repair and paint buildings where necessary

290- Ensure that shop rents are affordable for businesses

295, 315- The main shopping area definitely needs enhancing and kept clean. The canopies in Station Road are looking very tired and need maintenance. Why not approach the UK Lottery for part funding.

72- Adding commercial hotels would ruin the character of the town

86- B&B's are good, but what is our unique selling point going to be for visitors

140- Please include South west and South east areas of Westgate-on-Sea as potential areas for inclusion for boutique hotels and b&b applications

168, 188, 239, 261, 284- Rental housing should be prioritised over air BnB rentals, which are pricing out locals

196, 199- Residents are just as important as tourists, caution on promoting tourism

215- With any new tourist facilities there must be appropriate niche shops and high street shops where traffic is controlled as a pleasant place to shop. B and B s and AirBnbs need to be registered and cost controlled by a local tourist organisation...(perhaps] not the local authority.

270- Toilets are very important with shower for our seaside. Parking for motorhomes with water and waste payable

22- The smell of seaweed is atrocious

259- No comment provided

332 Comments - WSNP4 - This Policy conflicts with adopted Local Plan policy E06 which states that residential accommodation will be permitted in District and Local centres where this would not fragment or erode the active frontages of such locations to a degree that undermines the function of the centre. The impact assessment proposed in the policy could be used as a tool to assess this.

333 Comments - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: Consideration should be given to the fact that any increase in households requires a proportionate increase in sustainable infrastructure provision, commensurate with the profile of the occupants. PROW (Public Rights of Way): The County Council recommends that reference is made to the County Council's ROWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) to better enable partnership working to continue and deliver improvements to the PROW network in Westgate. The NP should consider the need for accessible tourism, leisure, shopping and employment facilities - for residents and visitors to the area. The PROW network and the ROWIP has a critical role in this, and as such there should be specific mention to the need to support improvements to walking and cycling routes where they can assist the County Council's objectives within the ROWIP.

Response to Comments:

Comments 16, 126, 162, 242 Please see response to comments 66, 280 in the objection section above.

Comments 148, 45, 60, 87, 154, 290, 295, 315 This theme is already sub-divided into Tourism and shopping, with separate policies supporting both. The suggestions for supporting business uses, such as meeting spaces and hot desking would be supported through the Change of Use of units already allowed by Permitted Development rights and they are supported under policy WSNP4. The types of businesses/shops that take up the spaces are market lead and not determined and the continued organic growth in this manner is how the shopping area has grown over time. The idea of improving the shopping area through painting, cleaning and applying for heritage grants etc is supported by WoSTC, however this would be championed through their council meetings and does not need to be included as a policy in the NP. The provision of a supermarket for the Town would need to be considered at a more strategic level with the support of a supermarket provider. This will be reverted to TDC for their information. No changes to NP proposed.

Comments 72, 86, 140, 168, 188, 239, 261, 284, 196, 199, 215- Please read the response to comments 167, 121, 177, 331, 238, 246 in the objection section above relating to tourist accommodation and AirBnBs. The support for tourist accommodation originally comes from the community survey which was undertaken at the start of the NP process. No changes required.

Comments 270 and 22- The services provided for visitors are also important for the community. Motorhomes are now restricted from parking on the seafront. Seaweed is a natural product and is dealt with annually by the district council. The policy and theme, as written, does not prevent tourist accommodation being provided in the South west and South east areas of Westgate-on-Sea as. But the area of specific support is seen as the spatial result of the community and conservation area work.

Comment 332 Change the first paragraph of page 26 as follows: "*WTC will seek to protect existing businesses and shops from changes of use that will erode the frontages of the local centre and undermine its function as a commercial centre. to residential and it will not support change of use to ground floor residential for those properties in Map A and Map A1. In order to support this aim WTC, in addition to policy WSNP3, will be seeking to work with TDC to implement an Article 4 direction which will remove permitted development rights and the conversion of existing commercial premises at ground floor level*".

Comment 333: Noted, regarding the proportionate increase in sustainable infrastructure provision, this will be dealt with at the planning application stage and assessed by Thanet District Council. Amend the last sentence of paragraph 11.2 as follows: "*The development of B&Bs or boutique hotels would also be encouraged in the East Zone of the seafront as would improvements to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network*".

Didn't respond to this theme:

36, 41, 97, 107, 231, 278,

Theme 3 Heritage:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 297, 298, 299, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331

Summary:

The community are supportive of the policy approach to protect the heritage assets of the town and acknowledge that this provides the town its character and charm. It supports the economy and gives a sense of place to the community.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

61, 66, 84, 139, 177, 231, 236, 240, 255, 296

Summary and Response:

66- Overbuilding and overcrowding destroys any 'protection' you're planning.

177, 240- Again, stop stopping progress. Old buildings are boring to look at. They scream "nimbys stuck in the past". We need to move with the times, why can't out town be modern with history too.

231- Comments - WSNP8 - states that the WTC will not support applications that disturb scheduled ancient monuments and their setting (emphasis added). Whilst we understand the purpose, the policy should be amended as 'disturbing' the setting is not the correct application of national and strategic policy. We suggest it should be reworded to state "WTC will not support applications that adversely affect the integrity or setting of Scheduled Monuments disturb schedule ancient monuments and their setting"
(although this will then be a direct replication of Local Plan policy and unnecessary on this basis

61, 84, 139, 236, 255, 296- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 66, 177 and 240 *This theme and associated policy are titled 'heritage' as they are in place to support the heritage of the town. Heritage is important as it helps us learn from the past and enables the strong sense of place and history which gives the town its identify. Heritage is also protected through the NPPF.*

The NP is not trying to stifle progress, there is support from Historic England and other conservation charities which provide guidance for retrofitting carbon neutral progress into old development. But, the NP is asking that this is respectful of the heritage and the conservation identify. No changes to the policy required.

Comment 231 *Disagree The policy requests an impact assessment which will help assess the disturbance and the impact on the setting at Planning Application stage. Therefore, the policy should be retained as is. Note the typo in the policy, it should state 'scheduled'.*

I wish to add something (Omission)

36, 56, 60, 68, 86, 111, 126, 140, 163, 242, 261, 290, 295, 300, 301, 312, 316, 333

Summary and Response

56, 261- How much is the protection going to cost. Where will the funding come from?

60- This must be supported by concerted efforts to gain there funding to support the protection of heritage assets. Many homeowner for example could not afford heritage refits or repairs. There is also a skills shortage in this type of work to be carried out to the right standards. The plan should recognise these challenges and spell out how these will be addressed.

316- "Totally agree with the preservation of our heritage features. No huge new builds that cater for migrating Londoners and not for siblings of local residents, that cannot afford the so called ""affordable"" new homes that hopefully will be dead in the water the moment they hit the planning department of our Thanet District Council . The balance is fast being eroded, all for the sake of greed"

68, 86, 301, 312- I am ok with keeping the character of the area, however I don't like the idea of conservation areas and listing buildings as it stifles improvement and self-creativity. I find that anywhere that has this type of planning restrictions encourages nimbyism. Preserve yes but allow contemporary architecture too, we need to see novel buildings and methods to leave our mark on the history of the area for future generations too. I don't think architecture should be held in stasis, so whilst it needs to be sympathetic, we should allow interesting new architecture. Also, newer methods help address issues of space and of eco living, as well as solving social issues and helping with inclusiveness. Shouldn't prevent green innovations.

163- Heritage will be irrelevant in my great grandson's era. He will need an affordable home.

242- Building should certainly be listed, but the use of that building should be flexible and not fixed. Areas change over time and our areas must be able to adapt.

111, 126- Anything that is no longer an asset, or is in a state of utter decay, should be considered for removal, or reinvention. You cannot protect property that is substandard in this way. This is what drives developer's away from working with parish and district councils. You must open your eyes to global warming and preserving lives and community at the expense of people them delve. There is to much negativity in Thanet again reinventing ourselves and protecting ourselves again what is coming our way. The sea rise and weather disruptions and destruction.

36- Do the plans include the other side of Canterbury Road?

140- Ensure the Pavilion is included and may be expand the conservation areas.

290- Support in general but I think that the green cliff top areas should be protected too.

300- It hasn't helped Summerland's being a listed building. Westgate Council don't seem to have any weight to prevent any material damage that has occurred to this wonderful building on the canterbury Road next to St Augustine's.

333- Heritage Conservation: The County Council will engage directly with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to discuss the heritage conservation content of this Neighbourhood Plan.

295- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 56, 261 and 60, 163, 316 *It is noted that the cost to repair and maintain listed heritage assets comes at an expense. But purchasing or taking ownership of an asset means that the owner is legally bound to keep the asset in good condition. Several heritage charities are in a position to help with these costs of repairs are out of reach of the owner. Unfortunately, the NP would not be in a position to help fund repairs of buildings, especially if they are in private ownership.*

Comments 68, 86, 301, 312 and 111 and 126, 142 *see response to Comments 66, 177 and 240, in addition the NP provides policies to help tackle climate change. If a building has been nationally listed then there are legal obligations to maintain it. Just because a building is in a state of decay it doesn't mean that it should be completely reinventing or replacing. It is considered that the policy as currently written provides enough of a 'hook' to ensure that the viability and vitality of buildings will be enduring.*

Comments 36, 140, 290 *Although Conservation Areas are not set in stone the Westgate CA is a long-established entity, which has a clear justification and assessment set by TDC. It is considered that the support given to the policy, as written, strongly overrides the need to reassess and review the whole CA. No changes required.*

Comments 300 *Summerland's is a listed property and the recent damage through building working is currently under investigation with TDC and the appropriate legal action is taking place. No changes to the NP required.*

Comment 333 *No further contact from KCC received.*

Didn't respond

32, 40, 75, 92, 107, 308

Theme 4 Sustainability:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330

Summary:

There was significant support for improving the sustainability of the town and new development through the NP.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

12, 56, 76, 84, 205, 235, 252, 255, 292, 296

Summary and Response:

56- Pie in the sky thinking

205, 252, 292- I don't support the current housing developments full stop. Of course all building should be sustainable and environs sensitive but I don't support these developments. No to 2000 houses. Don't need any more new housing in our area it will be overpopulated and will affect local services immensely.

12, 76, 84, 235, 255, 296- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comment 56 *The NP is striving to put climate change at the forefront if its narrative.*

Comments 205, 252, 292 *Please note previous comments relating to the new development of 200 homes and the comments against Theme 8.*

I wish to add something (Omission)

25, 40, 60, 67, 68, 78, 86, 106, 111, 119, 140, 146, 154, 163, 177, 183, 200, 211, 215, 219, 228, 230, 238, 242, 259, 262, 267, 276, 284, 300, 307, 315, 331, 332

Summary and Response

25, 67, 154, 219- Stop building in Thanet!! There are too many new houses proposed for Westgate on Sea and surrounding areas, with no schools hospitals and doctors surgeries included in this. Agree with sustainability but not with new housing - don't turn Westgate which has so much old-fashioned charm into a soulless housing estate - we've moved away from that !

111, 183, 284- No building on Green or arable land. Drainage system must not be overloaded. as long as any new houses are not built on agricultural. Keep us much green space as possible and limit size of developments land this land is valuable for supplying food and once it is gone you cannot get it back there are many other areas where new houses could be built

267- Westgate does not need more housing it wants more shops.

60, 68, 146, 215- The sustainability could be more ambitious in its aim and vision, Westgate as an eco-seaside town, ' simple' measures could include car sharing, reduce speed to no more than 20mph, including the main canterbury road, more street lighting but dimmed, create its own sustainable electricity, partnerships with other eco towns across Europe to learn, educational and public awareness measures around this objective etc "Within any new building or development there should be charge points for electric cars, and future facility for other vehicular energy supplies like hydrogen. For any developments road network schools and medical centres must come first. New road infrastructure needs to be the "whole route " and not be road which is widened just 50 metres in front of a new estate, where you end up back on a single lane road..... E.g. the link road through to Westwood Cross from Margate." We need to allow more for sustainability. PV solar cells to be allowed. Electric car charging points must be provided for all new developments. Residential SUDS drainage to provide water storage for watering gardens. I would like to see any new builds include 'green' initiatives like insulation solar panels and ground sourced heat pumps to ensure sustainability as well as your ideas on water conservation.

307- Builders must use appropriate insulation and low carbon materials not just be encouraged this is a must not a choice

78, 119, 276- Need to confirm what encouraged means. The word "encourage" should be replaced with "insist." Builders will always maximise profits over standards and "encourage" is meaningless. This should push more strongly than simply encouraging environmentally friendly changes.

242, 331- We should insist on (rather than encourage) the use of locally sourced sustainable materials. Water runoff is a critical factor going forward, especially as a lot of the local open farmland will have housing built on it. Where possible, use local trades and materials.

40- Whilst agreeing in principal, developers will no doubt use the cover of a NHBC policy to justify their goodwill. As NHBC hardly ever pay out on a claim, this should be taken into consideration.

200, 211, 228, 238- Excellent objective, however without sanctions on the dumping of sewage into our bays, such ideals have little chance of success. Sewage capacity should also be an essential consideration. Southern Water needs to upgrade their infrastructure if we are to build more houses.

Otherwise sewage release will continue to be a problem. My fears are not only surface water but more importantly sewage as our treatment system continues to pollute our beaches and with all these new homes can only increase the amount pumped into the sea.

177- Sustainable drainage is top jokes guys. Drainage is drainage.

230- This area of plan causes me concern as building may exacerbate flooding risks

140- Ensure who is responsible if a defect is detected. As example water pipe breakage and road subsidence - a clear plan between developer (even if goes out of business), district council (even if road is still unadopted) & water company as to who will shoulder responsibility prior to any build.

86- Development needs to contain requirements to retain proportional conservations of the land on question and surveys by specialists on biodiversity with Costs met by developers should be standard practice. These should include recommendations about how the development could improve the local area not just mitigate damage to our ecosystem

106- Comprehensive restoration and expansion of roofing walkways

262- Off road car parking or parking for more than one vehicle per household should be high on the list in any new developments

300- Renewable energy very popular at moment but who would want to buy a property with a heating system that appears to be not fit for purpose and expensive to run. I think a mix of energies is best in case one system fails as in case of electricity.

315- New housing need reasonable sized gardens for families to entertain their children.

163- Impressive in theory only. Futuristic. Youngsters are the future.

259- No comment provided

332- The previous (places4people) comment to add 'proportionate to the location and scale of the development' has been included in this policy. However, this now needs criteria to define what that means, for example, a major development (i.e. over 10 dwellings), an application within flood zones 2 or 3 etc.

333- Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council is supportive of the aspiration to ensure that new developments pursue sustainable building practices. PRoW: Reference should be made to the opportunities offered through the PRoW network for sustainable transport and connectivity. County Council policy seeks to improve and upgrade the PRoW network where it links with amenities, public transport nodes, work and education to increase the attractiveness of Active Travel and support modal shift – this should be reflected within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Response to Comments:

Comments 25, 67, 154, 219, 111, 183, 284, 267 Please note previous comments relating to the new development of 2000 homes and the comments against Theme 8.

Comments 60, 68, 146, 215 Agreed that sustainability covers a greater field to just that of building new development. WoSTC has produced a Highway Improvement Plan which is reviewed annually. This travel plan currently focuses on problems with specific roads and crossings. But the suggestion to include improvements of sustainable transport nodes within it is duly noted and can be taken for the in future reviews. A note regarding the Highway Improvement plan will be included in the NP. Add a new sentence at the end of the penultimate paragraph of page 35 “...will be zero emissions by 2035. This is coupled with the drive towards sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, which will be included in the Westgate on Sea Highway Improvement Plan moving forward.”

Comments 78, 119, 276, 242, 331 Agree. Amend policy WSNP9 to read “...orientation for heating and cooling will be encouraged to follow the Building Regulations Part L: the Principles of Sustainable Construction.”

Comment 40: Out of the scope of the NP.

Comments 200, 211, 228, 238, 177, 230, 140- Noted the support for the policy and acknowledged that there has been illegal dumping of raw sewerage by Southern Water. WoSTC will look at lobbying the wastewater providers and TDC. But, it is considered that the NP would not be able to deal with the management of waste through the NP. The ownership of infrastructure would be dealt with on ongoing basis through the development process.

Comment 86 will be dealt with under the biodiversity theme

Comment 106 It is not clearly understood what is requested from this comment.

Comments 262, 315 Parking and outside space would be dealt with by the minimum parking and space standards set by the Local Plan.

Comments 163, 300 Noted but this is just an opinion of one commenter, some people fully endorse the use of green technologies.

Comment 332 Agree, improve policy WSNP10 by adding a footnote under the policy which states. *This NDP does not set specific criteria on what is required in terms of the contents of the report on surface water flood risk, surface water drainage and mitigation. But all new residential development in flood zone 2 and 3 and any development over 10 dwellings in flood zone 1 would need to provide it.

Comment 333 KCC's support on the sustainability policies is noted. Agree that the NDP could be improved by including text which supports PRoW as a source of sustainable travel. Add a new paragraph before the last paragraph on page 35

"Sustainable transport and connectivity are extremely important in any new development. New developments should provide new and usable walking routes and links to the existing Public Rights of Way network. Kent County Council policy currently seeks to improve and upgrade the existing PRoW network where it links with amenities, public transport nodes, work and education to increase the attractiveness of Active Travel and support modal shift and Westgate Town Council support this approach to sustainable travel".

Didn't respond

36, 41, 107, 158, 173, 189, 231, 275

Theme 5 Green and Open Spaces:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328

Summary:

The retention of green spaces was very important for the community and this was reflected in the positive support for the policies in the plan.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

25, 66, 67, 84, 146, 177, 231, 246, 252, 232

Summary and Response:

25- stop building anymore on Thanet!!!

66, 67, 252- We already have green and open spaces, stop building on them. Those green spaces must stay and at no point must anything be built on them.

146, 246- I think there should be stronger protection for the green wedges than what you are suggesting. The emphasis should be that they cannot be built on. There should be in development on green spaces / wedges for any reason.

177-We need affordable housing. We don't need Nimby's scared of losing a few k's off their house prices.

231 Comments - We note the aspirations behind the Westgate Countryside Triangle (WSNP13). However, WTC will be aware that the application site at the Gallops is purposefully defined to move development away from the northern boundary with the existing homes in order to minimise the number of homes directly affected.

As such, it varies from the allocated site boundary, for the betterment of the community. In doing so, the application relocates that area of development further to the south, to the western side of Minster Road. This area lies within the proposed Triangle. We suggest the Triangle is redefined to exclude the area which overlaps with the application site.

However, as noted in the NP, the area is active farmland, and there is no intention for it to be used in any different manner. Indeed it provides important crops for wintering birds (and will continue to do so following development of the Gallops site). It is not an area of countryside 'open space' (aside from the footpath which runs through it). This description should be amended.

In any event, the policy wording should be amended to reflect the correct figure number.

WSNP14 relates to Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. This policy replicates that in the Local Plan (E16) but without the important criteria against which exceptions can be assessed. This does not conform with the strategic policies of the Plan and will not therefore pass the Basic Conditions. It should be removed or amended to reflect the wording in the Local Plan.

332 Comments - WSNP13 - The area is protected by general countryside/farmland policies in the Local Plan, but there is no evidence to justify that it warrants any higher level of protection. The Scheduled Ancient Monument is protected by other policies. WSNP14 - This should follow LP Policy E16 which sets out the circumstances under which development would be acceptable.

84- No comment provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 25, 66, 67, 252 Please note previous comments relating to the new development of 2000 homes and the comments against Theme 8.

Comments 146, 246 The green wedge already has protection at district level in the Local Plan and it is important that the NP plan policy copies this and doesn't amend or alter overarching policy. No changes required.

Comment 177 Personal comment noted, but this is one comment against extensive support for the policy approach. No changes required.

Comments 231 and 332. Retain policy, evidence through the support of the local community warrants its inclusion. But amend the reference in policy WSNP13 to say Figure 14-5. In addition, to ensure the policy accords with the overarching plan, amend policy WSNP14 to read "Building on the best and most versatile agricultural land Development being proposed on the best and most versatile agricultural land other than that allocated in the TDC Local Plan will not be supported by Westgate Town Council".

I wish to add something (Omission)

16, 60, 86, 102, 104, 106, 119, 132, 134, 140, 148, 156, 163, 168, 183, 207, 211, 215, 278, 285, 329, 330, 331, 333

Summary and Response

102, 104, 106, 119, 156, 163, 207, 211, 278, 329, 330 - Requirement that no development be permitted on all farmland north of Shottendane Road, between Park Road and Garlinge High Street, under any circumstances, to ensure Westgate (and, by extension, Birchington and Garlinge) retains individual character in perpetuity and that the farmland continue to contribute to the local and national food security. No building on these areas at all. Legal protection is needed, get a proper legal base to the planning. We do not need any further housing in Westgate. All new developments are solely for the profits of developers and sold to buyers from outside Thanet at prices locals cannot afford. It is such a popular area for walkers and many other people. Protecting countryside to protect assets

207- I feel all the lovely country side is slowly disappearing all over Thanet and before long everywhere will be streets surrounded by houses , there are some really beautiful places in England and that is where the tourists will go , if we keep taking away what is attractive in and around Westgate , yes we have lovely beaches but the locals want to enjoy this to and the more people there are it will be harder to do this as not every likes busy and packed . The open countryside and all the beauty it brings is what makes us feel lucky to live here, please don't let it all go just to build more and more houses . our town is small and unspoilt so lets not change that as in the future this will be damaging to not only the environment, but to wildlife and beyond .

183-I hope this means you will include all agricultural land in this proposal as this is very important not only to residents but also to the economy of Thanet but also employment

132- Make sure the 2000 house development doesn't go through between Garlinge and Quex

Suggested green spaces:

16, 168- The old golf course at St Mildred's should be protected from development for housing/business and improved as a free to use outdoor leisure space.

134- Protecting all if those green spaces is great but this should have also been applied to the space in St. Mildred's court

140, 331- The south west open space Linksfeld Town Green must be included. Without this the demarcation between Westgate-on-Sea & Birchington will be lost. I would suggest that the open space area North of Linksfeld Town Green should also be protected from development.

215- There is also valuable green space along Lymington Road, and allotments which should be protected.

148- These spaces need proper policing and warden control

86- "We need to ensure there are spaces for young people to enjoy for free and that include facilities that are aimed at interests of girls (via consultation) not just those things that are traditionally boys (e.g. a football pitch) where girls can join in but it appeals more to boys. We also need to make sure these facilities are inclusive to those with physical disabilities and that we are considering what our autistic residents might enjoy/need and generally be more inclusive. Play areas should not focus on toddlers, outside equipment for teens and adults is equally important in encouraging a healthy outdoor lifestyle especially for those who may not have funds to pay out for activities, otherwise we would be encouraging the disparity with disadvantaged communities when we should be aiming solutions where they will Benefit all"

285- Our hedges at Epple Bay were not cut until November this year and looked so overgrown and messy. Pls can they be cut earlier to maintain the lovely greens around Epple Bay.

60- There needs to be a concept for these space how to link them and maintain them, development should be framed in terms of enhancing the experience for local people and visitors

333 - WSNP11 - Public Rights of Way (PRoW): The County Council is supportive of this policy, but. Section 14.2 PRoW: The provision of high quality open green spaces and opportunities for outdoor recreation should be a priority within the Neighbourhood Plan. It should aim to increase the provision of accessible green spaces and improve opportunities to access this resource.

Good public transport and active travel links with open spaces should be made available so that the public are not dependent on private vehicle use for visiting these sites. Section 14.3 PRoW: The County Council recommends that Public Bridleway TM28 and the relevant Public Footpaths should be referenced specifically. KCC recommends that reference is also made to the ROWIP which aims to aid decision-making and promote good design in PRoW and countryside access management. WSNP13 - Highways and Transportation: Whilst the intentions of this policy are understood, it is important to highlight that the Shottendane Road corridor is currently earmarked for improvement within the TTS and Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). As these highway improvements may require some of this land to be delivered in the most appropriate way, this policy should facilitate a level of flexibility to enable road widening and footway/cycleway infrastructure to be delivered without a policy conflict. PRoW: Specific reference should also be made to the PRoW within the site (TM28). WSNP14 - Highways and Transportation: The County Council draws attention to its comments in respect of Policy WSNP13 which are also applicable to this policy"

Response to Comments:

Comments 102, 104, 106, 119, 156, 163, 207, 211, 278, 329, 330, 207, 183, 132 Please note previous comments relating to the new development of 2000 homes and the comments against Theme 8.

Suggested green spaces:

Comments 16, 168 The old golf course at St Mildred's is outside of the WoS NP area boundary.

Comment 134 St Mildred's court is already built on.

Comments 140, 331 Linksfield Town Green is a designated Village Green with KCC and this is set out on page 38. However, agree that it should also be included as an LGS. Amend Table 14-1 on page 37 to include Linksfield Town Green.

Comment 215 Lymington Road allotments agree this should be added to the LGS already at the Lymington Road. Amend Table 14-1 second row to read "Community Green/ Community Centre/ Allotments"

Comment 85, 148 WoSTC note the aspirations for further warden control of greenspaces and facilities for younger generations. However, this cannot be undertaken through planning policy, but will be discussed by the council as potential projects for the town.

Comment 60 The concept of linking the LGS as an improvement for the community and visitors is a good idea. A virtual tour, through the use of leaflets and a self-guided walk, could potentially be considered by WoSTC as a way of linking the sites and giving people information about them. This will be discussed, but no changes are required in the NP.

Comments 285- Epple bay is in Birchington, outside of the NP boundary.

Comment 333 Accept, add reference to the Bridleway and Footpath in the paragraph under Figure 14-5 "The Westgate Countryside Triangle (WCT) is not public open space, it is in private ownership, but it is dissected by an actively, and well-used, public bridleway (TM28) and further footpaths (TM23, 27 and 39) link the town to this area and through to the countryside beyond. In response to the comments from KCC Highways, amend the second paragraph of p41 to read: "The Gallops" development proposal on the adjoining site, is significantly increasing the number of dwellings in Westgate and the area around the Shottendane Road corridor is currently earmarked for improvement within the TTS and Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Despite this, it is important that the existing and new residents are still able to access the countryside and the benefits that this provides." Also add an additional element to policy WSNP13 so it reads:

Land to the north of Park Road and Shottendane Road and south of the proposed allocation in the TDC Local Plan as shown in Figure 14-5, the "Westgate Countryside Triangle" should be retained as countryside open space and the use of the area as an area for nature conservation/biodiversity net gain should be actively encouraged.

Planning permission will not be granted for development in the WCT unless it relates to improvements to sustainable transport links and promotion of accessibility in the local area. Note that there is a typo in the 3rd par of p41. It should state WCT (and not WTC).

Didn't respond to theme

36, 88, 103, 107, 166, 189

Theme 6 Biodiversity:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204,

205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330

Summary:

There was support and acknowledgement from the responders of the survey that the WoS area has a significant amount of biodiversity and this should be protected through the NP.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

66, 84, 177, 236, 252

Summary and Response:

66, 252- Leave the trees alone. Trees shouldn't be cut down to make way for 2000 houses

177- Doesn't a Westgate Councillor run foraging courses, is that not a huge conflict of interest and breaching the standards of public life?

84, 236- No comments provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 66, 252 agree that trees should not be removed, although planning policy can only protect trees with a Tree Preservation Order. Amend policy WSNP15 to read as follows: "The application for the removal of protected trees ~~within Westgate's conservation area~~ will not be supported unless they are shown to be a hazard."

Comment 177 It is not considered a conflict because the Cllr in question has left the Council and is no longer a Cllr.

I wish to add something (Omission)

25, 36, 45, 59, 60, 82, 87, 106, 111, 126, 128, 140, 163, 169, 188, 211, 215, 218, 242, 243, 259, 267, 284, 300, 315, 331

Summary and Response

59, 169, 188, 242- A replacement scheme could be considered, e.g. one tree down for 4 new ones of similar type in an agreed location. Trees in the open spaces or bordering roads to be replaced when they have been felled in the past or may need to be in the future for reasons of age or other causes, such as damage by vehicles or pedestrians. Where it necessary to remove hazardous trees, arrangements should be put in place to ensure replacement planting of identical/similar trees to help maintain the areas biodiversity. Could the removal of a tree be offset - by planting new trees in a different area?

126- All trees within 5meters of any building and more than 5meters tall should be exempted as these are the max limits of the domestic insurance market restriction.

128, 218, 284- To plant more trees in green open spaces and keep as many trees as possible.

267, 315- Some trees in Elm Court, need to be cut down because people have to put their lights on in their flats all day. Some of the trees are allowed to get too big especially trees near houses thus taking away their essential light.

163- Trees can be planted at low cost. Sentiment for trees will soon be very outdated

215- "Tree planting grants are available. Hedgerows around extensive file systems should be encouraged to be planted. Presumably, the airport will not return, and nor will the war! I have never seen a county with so few hedgerows, and they are such a valuable wildlife habitat.

High level wildlife surveys needed for development areas: which actually determine presence and densities of full range of protected species"

82, 87, 111, 243- If we have these areas, they must be tended regularly, so as not to look scruffy and unkept. As long as it doesn't become an excuse not to tend to weeds and overgrown areas under the guise of biodiversity. Areas should not be left, so as to cause further cost to the council on upkeep.

45-If trees are in roads (see Westbury Road) and roots are infringing on roads, breaking surfaces they need dealing with annually not wait till there is an accident. I agree with helping the wildlife etc but the grass needs cutting regularly along the sea road. Please don't leave it like this year. It causes lots of problems and people can't use the benches and walk down onto the beach.

60- Biodiversity could be a collective effort by raising awareness as to what people with gardens can do themselves to help to increase diversity of plants and insects. It needs to link as to how the beaches are used and biodiversity is monitored there and the public is informed. Identify spaces for new trees to be planted could also be an objective

300- Generally support but consideration needs to be given on the actual practical management of such schemes as wildflower areas by gardeners.

331- "Shown to be a significant hazard". Additions of green infrastructure (i.e. green roofs/living wall) will be supported. Support application that adopts biodiversity net again.

140- Registers should be held of where foraging can occur, Blackberry, damson and sloe picking for example. Shoreline foraging is another area but probably left to more expert operators who could be listed

25- Just doing that isn't enough, we need more open green spaces for the mental health of the current population, and any new population that will live here.

211- Housing Developments are detrimental to aims to increase biodiversity and preserve green spaces

106- No more concreting of driveways!

36, 259- No comments provided

Response to Comments:

Comments 59, 169, 188, 242, 126 Noted, please see the proposed amendment to policy WSNP15 set out in the objection section. The conflict of trees too close to buildings would need to be looked at on an individual basis.

Comments 126, 128, 218, 284, 267, 315, 163, 215, 60, 300, 331, 60- *WoSTC supports the planting of new trees and wildflowers etc. and it is always happy to look at new planting opportunities and how planting benefits could be promoted within the town. However, it is noted that trees and meadows need ongoing maintenance and this needs to be factored into any maintenance programme. No changes needed to the NP as this work is considered to be more of a community project than in the scope of development planning.*

Comments 82, 87, 111, 243 *Noted see above response*

Comment 45 *Noted and agree but this is already covered by the current policy as this would be considered a 'hazard'.*

Comment 331 *Unsure of what the comment is trying to set out.*

Comment 140 *Noted, the WoSTC are not experts on foraging but will consider looking into this further to ensure that the current rules and regulations are being adhered to, and if not, this will be suitably reported. It is out of the scope for amendment to the NP.*

Comment 25 *Noted- please refer to Local green Spaces*

Comments 106, 211 *Please refer to previous response relating to the proposed housing development of 2000 homes.*

Didn't respond to this theme

11, 24, 41, 51, 189, 231, 271

Theme 7 Facilities:

Supports:

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101,

102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 299, 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330

Summary:

The community supported the list of community facilities that the NP was proposing to support.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

66, 84, 92, 132, 145, 236, 304, 332

Summary and Response:

92- I am opposed to the proposal to build a new housing estate and hotels etc in this area as I fear Westgate will lose its character

66, 84, 132, 145, 236, 304 - No comments provided

332- WSNP17 - A 'full viability assessment' is not appropriate here - the policy needs to explain what the viability issue should demonstrate. You could use wording based the Local Plan policy CM02 clause 2 'every reasonable attempt has been made to secure an alternative community use and the site is not viable for redevelopment to provide alternative community facilities' WSNP18 - The infrastructure requirements for all of the Strategic Sites were considered with all of the relevant bodies (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan). These were considered and agreed at the Local Plan Examination in Public. WSNP19 & WSNP20 - At this stage, the Council has not implemented CIL in addition to s106, as it would make development in most areas of the district unviable. Policy WSNP19 should be deleted as a Neighbourhood Plan cannot enforce the implementation of CIL. The range of Section 106 contributions has already been agreed through the Local Plan process."

Response to Comments:

Comment 92 See previous response regarding the proposed 2000 home development

Comments 332 *Noted, amend policy WSNP to "WSNP17 Safeguarding community facilities- Existing community facilities or those gaining planning permission for such use will be safeguarded from other prejudicial development on or adjacent to the site. Where it is demonstrated that a community facility is no longer viable, then planning applications for change of use or redevelopment will only be considered if they are supported by an assessment which sets out why the current community use and potential alternative community uses are no longer viable or appropriate on the site". WSNP18 leave this policy in, it isn't against the overarching policy, but sets a clear steer as to what is acceptable for the Town Council. This should be assessed by the Planning Examiner. In response to WSNP 19 and 20 amend the second paragraph after 16.3 to read "The Town Council has been made aware that TDC will not be collecting money through the community infrastructure levy system and the NP is not proposing to allocate housing development. Therefore, it would seem that this NP will not afford the Town any benefit through this scheme. However, should CIL charging come to fruition in the Thanet area, Westgate Town Council would like to be in a positive position to obtain community benefits from CIL contributions from the outset." Retain policy WSNP20 but amend the wording to state "WSNP20- Section 106 Developments with clear, viable section 106 agreements will be supported by Westgate Town Council. Section 106 monies that improve the amenities in the town will be encouraged utilising projects set out in the list in Appendix 1.*

I wish to add something (Omission)

25, 60, 67, 82, 97, 106, 119, 126, 127, 140, 163, 177, 196, 201, 207, 211, 215, 238, 295, 300, 307, 331, 333

Summary and Response

25, 119- No further development of housing is required. It sounds good but I dislike any idea of more properties in this area, the roads are already too busy.

60- This needs to link with a concept for attracting sustainable local investment, a place to work and live, better infrastructure for walking and cycling, including school runs

67, 82, 126, 211- The proposed building of the house behind Westgate etc will doubtless generate and increased population of some 8 to 10 thousand peoples and there is insufficient GP cover in Westgate now!!!! I've been unable to see my doctor for months. This need to be thought about and real issues face head on not just brushed aside. New town should be built not just rage thousands of houses onto existing villages. It just destroys them in time. Any additional surgeries, etc are put in place before building starts

106- Not "a focus" but a "priority " is a must for docs, dentists etc.

207, 211, 238- Maybe we could sort out the current problems with sewage going into the sea before we start adding more and more , we need to look at things that need doing now for the residents that already live in the area before we do anything else

Southern water held accountable and not pay dividends to shareholders.

97- We need a gym

127- CIL should be preferred to s106. Would like to see improvements for cyclists - in conjunction with KCC's proposals for Canterbury Rd - as Thanet is in the dark ages in this respect. Definitely invest in existing assets, particularly the library which has a great location (as in easy for all to reach) and should be open much longer with space for events and activities for all.

140, 196, 215- Include the Pavilion for community continues use. The Westgate Pavilion should be renovated and brought back into use as a Theatre

177- Get the skatepark rebuilt by a company that isn't the clowns who built Broadstairs and minster. The current one is unsafe and there's huge risk of claims on public liability insurance if anyone were to injure themselves through lack of said maintenance.

201- Speed bumps should be installed on Minster Road to reduce traffic speed

295- A pedestrianised crossing is needed in St Mildred's Road. It's a nightmare to cross safely.

300- Strongly support updating Westgate iconic library and use of first floor. Also. improvement of community centre and the dreadful carpark there but think this should be carried out without having to rely on a new development being built in location.

163- Westgate needs to grow with the current younger generations and their needs

307- It is essential to maintain community assets to support local people

215- A register of air b n b and a licensing scheme to help maintain sufficient percentage of affordable rentable properties for local population."

333- WSNP17 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council is supportive of the objective of safeguarding existing community facilities provided that they currently (or could in the future), meet the evolving needs of the Westgate community and provide appropriate space for relevant and evolving needs. However, the safeguarding of community facilities should not be limited only to the preservation of buildings. Other forms of community facilities such as resources for outreach youth work, or social care to support the elderly to live independently, should also be considered valuable.

Highways and Transportation: The County Council, as Local Highway Authority, would refute the suggestion within this section that the Transport Plan (which it assumes to be a reference to the TTS) was not written in conjunction with planned housing. The TTS was developed over several years (in conjunction with the Local Planning Authority) within the context of the Local Plan process, where several changes were made to draft land allocations. Substantial housing allocations were identified within Westgate and Birchington at an early stage of the process which were increased in size as the Plan progressed, and these increases were considered as the TTS evolved at each stage.

The principles of the TTS, and specifically the Inner Circuit Route Improvement Strategy (ICRIS), were communicated to elected council members throughout the plan making process. The draft TTS document was included within the Regulation 19 consultation undertaken by the Local Planning Authority which local stakeholders had an opportunity to comment on. The Draft TTS was also referred to at the Local Joint Transportation Board, where it received a very positive response. It is relevant to point out that recently, KCC, as the Local Highway Authority, has gratefully received support from the Town Council for the ongoing bid to the Department for Transport for grant funding towards the delivery of sections of the ICRIS. Therefore, KCC would encourage the Town Council to reconsider the text in this section of the Plan.

The provisions within policy WSNP18 are already encompassed within the NPPF and do not need to be replicated within this Plan."

"333 Comments - WSNP18 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council is supportive of the objectives of this policy and strongly agrees that any new development should provide mitigation for its impact on existing services. Infrastructure to support proposed new development in Westgate will need to be considered above and beyond those specifically named in Section 16.2 (i.e. road improvements, the provision of doctors and dentists and sewerage capacity).

Other county services that will require infrastructure contributions/provision are:

- Primary education, as well as early years nursery provision – through the provision of a new on-site 2FE primary school and nursery
- Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision – through planned expansion at specific schools (Garlinge Primary, Hartsdown Secondary and East Kent Junior College)
- Secondary education – through the delivery of the new Park Crescent Secondary School
- Social care – five key priority areas (see comments below on WSNP21)
- Adult education – through the improvement of existing facilities at Hawley Square and by extending adult education classes into the community
- Youth services – through targeted outreach services according to need
- Libraries – improvements at Westgate Library (see further detail in WSNP20 below)
- Waste processing – through the Margate Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) expansion project
- High speed broadband for all new dwellings PRow: The County Council recommends that this policy should include walking and cycling connectivity across the Parish, giving priority to Active Travel routes as appropriate."

"333 Comments - WSNP19 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council raises a query as to the inclusion of this policy and its wording given that Thanet District Council has not adopted the levy. If CIL was to be adopted by Thanet District Council, KCC will require allocations from funds received to mitigate impacts upon its services locally from new development to avoid any reduction/dilution of services to existing residents. Highways and Transportation: The supporting text in paragraph 16.4 appears to raise concerns over the delivery mechanism for the new road system (ICRIS), but then suggests that the contributions towards highway infrastructure should instead be diverted to projects identified within Appendix 1. The projects set out in Appendix 1 do not provide an alternative strategy to manage the traffic impacts of development. Therefore, this approach is not supported by the Local Highway Authority. The evidence provided by the Local Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority at the Thanet Local Plan examination provides an overview of infrastructure apportionment which developments are expected to broadly comply with. In tandem with this funding stream, KCC is exploring potential external funding streams with an aim to provide ICRIS infrastructure as soon as possible. Whilst the timing of infrastructure is still subject to more detailed discussions and appraisal, KCC, as the Local Highway Authority, remains committed to pursuing funding for the delivery of the ICRIS and this should be reflected within the text.

PRow: The County Council would recommend that specific mention is made to the need to improve and enhance the PRow network to enable safe and attractive walking and cycling connections and links from new developments to community facilities. An increased population will undoubtedly add to the pressure and importance of the surrounding PRow network. It is critical therefore that some general wording is included within this section to secure funding to ensure these highly regarded links are not degraded. Developer contributions could be used to upgrade existing routes or create new path links that address existing network fragmentation issues."

"333 Comments - WSNP20 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council is supportive of the allocation of section 106 monies in mitigating the impact of the development across all relevant county services (as listed above), including highways. KCC supports the allocation of section 106 monies to local services and facilities such as those listed in Appendix 1 if these facilities can meet the evolving needs of the local community and are the most effective way of delivering services. Westgate Library does not currently meet inclusivity standards and KCC supports the allocation of section 106 library monies to this project. KCC proposes that a new lift is installed to allow the building to be used to its full capacity and additional monies may be used to further enhance local library services and resources such as through the provision of book stock and/or digital library resources.

KCC would not support the ring-fencing of all section 106 community services contributions, for a single community centre. Whilst the Lymington Road Community Centre listed in

Appendix 1 may be very close to a development site, it would not be appropriate to limit the monies to one building. The Lymington centre may also not be the most appropriate support for the community requirement(s) at the time of need.

As referenced in section 16.4, the upgrading of existing buildings and the provision of new physical infrastructure (such as a sports centre or skate park) is one way, but not the only way, to deliver facilities or resources for young people. The needs of young people and the support they require is continuing to evolve in a post-Covid-19 society. Youth outreach work to address more complex needs such as substance abuse or mental health crises cannot be addressed without the adequate resourcing of services delivered under Early Help and Preventative Services (EHP)."

Response to Comments:

Comments 25, 119, 60, 67, 82, 126, 211 Please see previous response relating to the proposed 2000 home development.

Comments 207, 211, 238 Please see previous response relating to southern water and illegal dumping of sewerage.

Comment 97 Noted this would be supported through the existing WSNP4 policy

Comments 140, 196, 215 Although it would be an great asset to the town to reinstate the Pavilion, it would be out of the scope of the NP to deliver this project. Ongoing ideas for this project will be discussed by the WoSTC.

Comment 177 The existing skatepark has recently undergone investment to improve the facilities there.

Comments 201, 295 These will be discussed as part of the annual review of the Westgate Highways Improvement Plan

Comment 300 Noted

Comments 163, 307 Agree It is essential to maintain community assets to support local people

Comment 215 Please see previous comments on Airbnb's

Comment 127, 333 In response to the comments made by KCC. It is noted that social community benefits are important. But, this policy relates specifically to assets, therefore this policy should be retained as set out in the regulation 14 plan. The comments relating to the wider consultation on road infrastructure are noted, but the comments stated in the NP are the accepted opinion of the community and they do not impact on the integrity of the plan. Therefore, no amendments to the NP are to be made. Comments relating to the potential projects that the S106 money could support are acknowledged and provide helpful background to what work that needs undertaking. But, again, the projects set out in this plan are those which are important and have been chosen by the community for their community. Therefore, on this basis no further changes are required.

Didn't respond

22, 31, 36, 41, 107, 183, 189, 221, 231, 257, 275, 280, 298

Theme 8 New Developments:

Supports:

6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 89, 90, 91, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 157, 158, 159, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 200, 202, 204, 206, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 232, 233, 237, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 264, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 293, 294, 297, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327

Summary:

General support was provided to the approach taken by the NP to set out a statement which proposes the WoSTCs position in regard to should a development come to fruition in this location.

Response:

Noted

Objects:

9, 12, 24, 41, 44, 53, 54, 63, 66, 71, 76, 82, 88, 92, 95, 97, 103, 113, 120, 122, 128, 156, 160, 173, 177, 183, 201, 205, 219, 228, 231, 234, 235, 236, 243, 246, 247, 252, 253, 261, 262, 267, 271, 285, 292, 296, 299, 316

Summary and Response

7, 86- I would prefer the scheme be stopped altogether. But if that cannot happen, I would want robust evidence of the need and would agree with the measures mentioned. Our local infrastructure cannot support so many houses and an independent report needs to be commissioned in respect of the impact to our local resources and green spaces and the impact on our ecosystem

56- Quality housing and supporting infrastructure is a must.

60- This also need to link to issue of connectivity that will allow to experience Westgate as community, the dual carriage way has already divided the town as has the railway, there needs to be an imaginative way to overcome these artificial divisions, the slowing down of traffic and better and safer use of highways for pedestrians and cyclists would be a start

7, 29, 87, 93, 101, 238, 278, 281- We also need to ensure we have the infrastructure and ability to support new developments which should not be built on green sites i.e. doctors, dentists, schools, drainage, utilities infrastructure, roads, bus and rail networks and employment for people! I would emphasise the need for services and infrastructure (e.g. schools, doctors, dentists) as these are already overstretched.

22, 25, 119, 168, 196, 203, 207, 217, 222, 230, 242, 263, 290, 295- No to the big new housing development. No to development of green fields, use brownfield sites or empty properties first. Do not build on agricultural land.

127, 315- What's proposed looks to be cheaply built, generic so-called executive homes with the minimum the developers can get away with in terms of biodiversity, community infrastructure and protection of existing amenity. TDC's confused approach is discouraging. If it goes ahead it should combine the best possible design and social outcomes. I disagree with your approach on the allocation of council homes - at the same time you say there is support for county or regional-wide planning and allocation so to restrict allocation of social housing to "local" people isn't logical. Planning for this absolutely benefits from scale and the district level is the lowest it can reasonably be.

68- New properties should be properly affordable

211, 329. 330- New developments will only be detrimental to resident's village life climate and biodiversity.

40- New housing should not be sold to outside local authorities. This would prevent wealthy boroughs using seaside towns like ours to relocate their residents.

300-Any new development should have adequate car parking and space between housing. Just have to look at St Augustine's development- tall narrow housing mainly with tiny Gardens and lots of cars parked on roads overnight.

328- Affordable for local residents

307- More high-quality housing is needed if all kinds: rental from housing associations as well as affordable properties so first-time buyers can buy in the area. This should be high quality housing not shoe boxes!!

45- Less holiday homes, local young people are being priced out due to the amount of second/holiday homes. Three empty in and around Rowena road have gone to holiday homes all 3 bedroom and not used most of the year

106- No response provided

163- A futuristic planning policy statement. A statement.

189, 199- In terms of the quantity, I can't judge as I don't know what the underlying needs-based facts are. However, I am very concerned that (as per existing new estates already being built) we are storing up trouble for the future with the 'shared ownership' schemes. We could have 2000 families all coming to the end of their contracts at the same time, unable to sell or move on and stuck in unfavourable deals.

332- Reference should be made to the current planning application. WSNP21 - Last para - the planning application boundary extends beyond the local plan boundary. This was a matter discussed at the Local Plan Examination, and the Inspectors indicated that the exact boundary should be considered through the planning application process. This policy must align with the Local Plan policy. WSNP22 - This wasn't supported by the Inspectors at examination. It is a matter for detailed design."

333 Comments - PRow: Specific mention should be made to improving and enhancing the PRow network, both within, and connecting to, the area between Westgate and Garlinge, as identified by the red dot line. This is to enable safe and attractive walking and cycling connections and links from new developments to community facilities.

Reference is also recommended to the presence of Public Bridleway TM28 and Footpaths TM26, 27 and 42, and the connection to Footpath TM23 from TM28. WSNP21 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council sets out its comments below: Strict 30% affordable housing quota - KCC supports new developments of mixed dwelling types and homes to meet a range of needs in the community. The affordable housing requirement of 30% must be balanced against required development contributions to support local infrastructure to ensure sustainable and viable growth.

Support for semi-assisted and assisted accommodation for the elderly – KCC supports the principle of enabling the elderly to remain in their own homes and/or live independently in accommodation with assistance on-site. Indeed, since the onset of Covid-19, there has been a significant decrease in the number of social care clients choosing to go into traditional care home settings. This shift towards specialist housing for the elderly has significant implications for the way in which these people need to be supported by county social care services and is requiring continuous adaptations in how assistance and care is provided. As such, with regard to section 106 contributions for this proposed development, it is important that resources are directed towards five key areas to increase capacity in Adult Social Care. These are:

- Assistive technology and home adaptation equipment – to enable people to continue to live independently
- Specialist Housing – Adult Social Care will purchase nomination rights from registered housing providers
- Adaptations and improvements to existing community facilities to enable all to be able to access these
- Provision of sensory facilities
- Provision of changing place facilities to enable those with profound physical and mental health issues (and their carers) to remain active and as independent as possible.

PRow: Reference to the PRow network and the ROWIP is recommended. It is imperative that open spaces within a development can be accessed through sustainable modes of transport. To encourage active travel provision and onward connectivity across the wider area, the wording of this text should be strengthened.

Response to Comments:

All comments *The timing of the consultation coincided with the submission of a hybrid outline planning application for 2000 homes on agriculture land on the outskirts of WoS, this planning application has been opposed by a large number of the community. However, there are other community members which support the provision of new housing, especially affordable and for younger generations and subsequently a balance and rounded view in the NP needs to be provided.*

Therefore, acknowledging that there is an overarching TDC policy in place and that plans and proposals for the scheme are at an advanced stage through the submission of a hybrid outline planning application. The NP has taken the approach of writing a statement which sets out what the aspirations of WoSTC are with regard to the new development on behalf of the community. The Town Council has considered the planning application at length and is continuously keeping this under review, there is a dedicated section on the WoSTC website which includes further details and the work undertaken to date. [Proposed 2000 Houses - Westgate-on-Sea Town Council - Westgate-on-Sea Town Council, Westgate-On-Sea \(westgateonsea.gov.uk\)](http://westgateonsea.gov.uk) .

WSNP22 should remain, on the whole, as drafted, it can be used to help guide the detailed design of this element of the scheme in accordance with the Planning inspector's suggestion of assessment at detailed design stage. With the exception of the following comments:

Amend the title of the policy to remove 'Policy' and call it just a statement.

Amend policy WSNP22 "The Town Council will support planning applications that take into account reasonable spacing between existing residents and new houses, ensuring that the new builds do not restrict light to the existing residents and also, where possible, leave open aspects, to include views and green design elements, next to the existing houses. In particular, the Town Council would support a functional green corridor that requires shape and provision for social and economic activities between the existing and the new 2000 houses. Good design promotes local business and economic growth along with providing for healthier lifestyles with readily available safe and attractive areas for exercise and recreation. There should be easy pedestrian access and adequate local transport to serve both new and existing development. Materials used and building appearances to reference not just the typical architecture of Westgate on Sea as a town but also that of rural Thanet. This could include tiled elevations, timber shiplap cladding as examples; vernacular architecture and design must be paramount."

I wish to add something (Omission)

7, 22, 25, 29, 40, 45, 56, 60, 67, 68, 86, 87, 93, 101, 106, 119, 127, 163, 168, 189, 196, 199, 203, 207, 211, 217, 222, 230, 238, 242, 263, 278, 281, 290, 295, 300, 307, 315, 328, 329, 330, 332, 333

Summary and Response

7, 86- I would prefer the scheme be stopped altogether. But if that cannot happen, I would want robust evidence of the need and would agree with the measures mentioned. Our local infrastructure cannot support so many houses and an independent report needs to be commissioned in respect of the impact to our local resources and green spaces and the impact on our ecosystem

56- Quality housing and supporting infrastructure is a must.

60- This also need to link to issue of connectivity that will allow to experience Westgate as community, the dual carriage way has already divided the town as has the railway, there needs to be an imaginative way to overcome these artificial divisions, the slowing down of traffic and better and safer use of highways for pedestrians and cyclists would be a start

7, 29, 87, 93, 101, 238, 278, 281- We also need to ensure we have the infrastructure and ability to support new developments which should not be built on green sites i.e. doctors, dentists, schools, drainage, utilities infrastructure, roads, bus and rail networks and employment for people! I would emphasise the need for services and infrastructure (e.g. schools, doctors, dentists) as these are already overstretched.

22, 25, 119, 168, 196, 203, 207, 217, 222, 230, 242, 263, 290, 295- No to the big new housing development. No to development of green fields, use brownfield sites or empty properties first. Do not build on agricultural land.

127, 315- What's proposed looks to be cheaply built, generic so-called executive homes with the minimum the developers can get away with in terms of biodiversity, community infrastructure and protection of existing amenity. TDC's confused approach is discouraging. If it goes ahead it should combine the best possible design and social outcomes. I disagree with your approach on the allocation of council homes - at the same time you say there is support for county or regional-wide planning and allocation so to restrict allocation of social housing to "local" people isn't logical. Planning for this absolutely benefits from scale and the district level is the lowest it can reasonably be.

68- New properties should be properly affordable

211, 329. 330- New developments will only be detrimental to resident's village life climate and biodiversity .

40- New housing should not be sold to outside local authorities. This would prevent wealthy boroughs using seaside towns like ours to relocate their residents.

300-Any new development should have adequate car parking and space between housing. Just have to look at St Augustine's development- tall narrow housing mainly with tiny Gardens and lots of cars parked on roads overnight.

328- Affordable for local residents

307- More high-quality housing is needed if all kinds: rental from housing associations as well as affordable properties so first-time buyers can buy in the area. This should be high quality housing not shoe boxes!!

45- Less holiday homes, local young people are being priced out due to the amount of second/holiday homes. Three empty in and around Rowena road have gone to holiday homes all 3 bedroom and not used most of the year

106- No response provided

163- A futuristic planning policy statement. A statement.

189, 199- In terms of the quantity, I can't judge as I don't know what the underlying needs-based facts are. However, I am very concerned that (as per existing new estates already being built) we are storing up trouble for the future with the 'shared ownership' schemes. We could have 2000 families all coming to the end of their contracts at the same time, unable to sell or move on and stuck in unfavourable deals.

332- Reference should be made to the current planning application. WSNP21 - Last para - the planning application boundary extends beyond the local plan boundary. This was a matter discussed at the Local Plan Examination, and the Inspectors indicated that the exact boundary should be considered through the planning application process. This policy must align with the Local Plan policy. WSNP22 - This wasn't supported by the Inspectors at examination. It is a matter for detailed design."

333 Comments - PRoW: Specific mention should be made to improving and enhancing the PRoW network, both within, and connecting to, the area between Westgate and Garlinge, as identified by the red dot line. This is to enable safe and attractive walking and cycling connections and links from new developments to community facilities.

Reference is also recommended to the presence of Public Bridleway TM28 and Footpaths TM26, 27 and 42, and the connection to Footpath TM23 from TM28. WSNP21 - Provision of County Council Community Infrastructure and Services: The County Council sets out its comments below: Strict 30% affordable housing quota - KCC supports new developments of mixed dwelling types and homes to meet a range of needs in the community. The affordable housing requirement of 30% must be balanced against required development contributions to support local infrastructure to ensure sustainable and viable growth.

Support for semi-assisted and assisted accommodation for the elderly – KCC supports the principle of enabling the elderly to remain in their own homes and/or live independently in accommodation with assistance on-site. Indeed, since the onset of Covid-19, there has been a significant decrease in the number of social care clients choosing to go into traditional care home settings. This shift towards specialist housing for the elderly has significant implications for the way in which these people need to be supported by county social care services and is requiring continuous adaptations in how assistance and care is provided. As such, with regard to section 106 contributions for this proposed development, it is important that resources are directed towards five key areas to increase capacity in Adult Social Care. These are:

- Assistive technology and home adaptation equipment – to enable people to continue to live independently
- Specialist Housing – Adult Social Care will purchase nomination rights from registered housing providers
- Adaptations and improvements to existing community facilities to enable all to be able to access these
- Provision of sensory facilities
- Provision of changing place facilities to enable those with profound physical and mental health issues (and their carers) to remain active and as independent as possible.

PRoW: Reference to the PRoW network and the ROWIP is recommended. It is imperative that open spaces within a development can be accessed through sustainable modes of transport. To encourage active travel provision and onward connectivity across the wider area, the wording of this text should be strengthened.

Response to Comments:

See above response against the objections

Didn't respond

36, 51, 107, 111, 154, 162, 191, 259, 298, 306, 331

Appendix 1 Responders:

6- J. Scott	37- C Mephram-Stone	68- J Sweeney	99- A J Eyberg
7- Anon	38- M Goodfellow	69- C Bennett	100- N Davies
8- J Brown	39- C Wellard	70- K Wolan	101- C Curtis
9- A Emery	40- S Clark	71- R Odell	102- K Hogben
10- A K Ward	41- Anon	72- Kay	103- Anon
11- M V Bennett	42- J Swindon	73- J Peverett	104- W Calcutt
12- Anon	43- D Gyves	74- C Medhurst	105- G Saint
13- A Nicoll	44- O St John-Jeffrey	75- C Hollister	106- W John
14- Richard	45- K Monks	76- L Thomson	107- Anon
15- S Wheeler	46- Anon	77- R McBride	108- M Appleton
16- Anon	47- P Mitchell	78- K Moule	109- R Hughes
17- B Hart	48- J Wales	79- N Hodgkinson	110- C McKerrell
18- A Gale	49- R Brenchley	80- K Broom	111- J O'Callaghan
19- M Osborn	50- J Kearns	81- D Moore	112- S Mackins
20- R Rolfe	51- Anon	82- S Brisley	113- Anon
21- P O'Connor	52- A Woodbridge	83- J Dungey	114- G Davis
22- Anon	53- A Culshaw	84- Anon	115- T Edwards
23- G Smith	54- G Shaw	85- C Attwood	116- Anon
24- M Stocken	55- A Bennett	86- K Clark	117- D Woodley
25- C Jarvis	56- M Vickers	87- S Taft	118- J Arnold
26- S Willmott	57- C Posnett	88- Anon	119- J Greves
27- Anon	58- M Lendrum	89- Anon	120- A Watson
28- R Blundell	59- Anon	90- G Rogers	121- K Watson
29- Anon	60- U Derksen	91- S Rolls	122- S Batley
30- G McGuirk	61- T Cousins	92- J Ross	123- M Morris
31- Olivia	62- P Ellis	93- P Jennings	124- S Posnett
32- S Ashley	63- B Parr	94- E Koravos	125- D P Denton
33- Jen	64- D Shaw	95- A Brown	126- O Wright
34- C Davies	65- C Windley	96- D Midgley	127- M Clarke
35- B Doulton	66- R Dearnley	97- S Croft	128- A Whittington
36- Anon	67- J Toms	98- A pennie	129- A Game

130- Anon	161- B Baltera	192- J Austin	223- Anon
131- D Owen	162- Emma	193- J Compton	224- D Thomsett
132- S Martin	163- C Nicholson	194- D Bradley	225- C Willett
133- L Fitzgerald	164- Anon	195- C Posnett	226- Anon
134- L Stewart	165- J Musselwhite	196- D Bottali	227- M Docherty
135- R Chaplin	166- P Wood	197- S Woodhall	228- S Burge
136- K Nightingale	167- M Rayner	198- D Gyves	229- R Brown
137- K Holmes	168- P Schofield	199- P Beene	230- C Miller
138- Anon	169- A Clark	200- S Clark	231- Millwood Designer Homes
139- R Morris	170- T Goldsmith	201- E Howe	232- Anon
140- G Rickett	171- V Stickland	202- S Stewart	233- D Twynam
141- Anon	172- J Spratt	203- A Burrows	234- Cameron
142- J Posnett	173- R Kirby	204- Anon	235- H Clifft
143- Anon	174- A Kirby	205- D Karakaya	236- T Lee-Alliston
144- J Hill	175- P Robinson	206- E Kearney	237- A Siddle
145- L Pressley	176- R Smith	207- Hattie	238- D Ross
146- N George	177- R Clements	208- S Thoroughgood	239- D Carr
147- P Neufeld	178- S Boorman	209- Anon	240- Tony
148- Anon	179- J Quay-Verlander	210- M O'Grady	241- Anon
149- J Scott	180- G Gray	211- P Wells	242- J Hely
150- J M Agnew	181- C Taylor	212- P Burton	243- H Waller
151- L Miller	182- M Wiseman	213- C Parsons	244- K Rimmer
152- K Pye	183- J Brown	214- J Burnell	245- M Dunn
153- J Palmer	184- A Day	215- J Dawkins	246- S Fuller
154- Anon	185- I Walton	216- E Tennent	247- S Taft
155- V Wilson	186- M Kennedy	217- S Mulley	248- C Rose-Sandhu
156- C Bradley	187- J Pye	218- D Rimmer	249- P Charman
157- S Baron	188- G Haworth	219- Anon	250- M Wilson
158- P Wilsher	189- A Squire	220- Anon	251- C Bilham
159- S Southgate	190- P Gildert	221- A Eyberg	252- A Green
160- C Pepper	191- Anon	222- G Andrew	253- T Barnfield

254- S Thorogood	287- Anon	320- R Taylor	
255- A Burgess	288- S Tomkins	321- S Crown	
256- Anon	289- R Seemann	322- L Hollingsworth	
257- R Stott	290- M Everest	323- A Hollingsworth	
258- A Bennett	291- Anon	324- B McNally	
259- T Thomas	292- L Russell	325- C Whittingham	
260- J Sessions	293- C Harvey	326- D Morrish	
261- K Tift	294- Anon	327- J Dabanovic	
262- Anon	295- C Hughes	328- A Metcalfe	
263- John Simeone	296- Anon	329- K Pendry	
264- J Randall	297- Peter	330- C Pendry	
265- J Spratt	298- S McIntyre	331- P Hasted	
266- J Ellis	299- Amanda	332- TDC	
267- Anon	300- J Pannell	333- KCC	
268- N Gilbert	301- Jennie		
269- P Heblik	302- Jennie		
270- M Vorpe	303- J Andrews		
271- D Moses	304- Anon		
272- S Robb	305- C Southworth		
273- C Warren	306- C Jewitt		
274- E Priest	307- H Turner		
275- J Tuvey	308- J Cornford		
276- E Cosh	309- Donna		
277- C Cooke	310- Anon		
278- Anon	311- D Humphreys		
279- Anon	312- E Martin		
280- B Woodbridge	313- S Underwood		
281- F Johnson	314- J Walton		
282- N Mccrea	315- M Francis		
283- D Owen	316- L Savory		
284- S Gilbert	317- A Simons		
285- J Elliston	318- C Wheatley		
286- Anon	319- T King		

