

WHITFIELD URBAN EXTENSION  
DRAFT MASTERPLAN SPD

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

SUBMITTED BY BARTON WILLMORE LLP  
ON BEHALF OF  
PHILLIP JEANS HOMES LTD

NOVEMBER 2010

**WHITFIELD URBAN EXTENSION  
DRAFT MASTERPLAN SPD**

**RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION  
SUBMITTED BY BARTON WILLMORE LLP  
ON BEHALF OF  
PHILLIP JEANS HOMES LTD**

Barton Willmore LLP  
The Observatory  
Southfleet Road  
Ebbsfleet  
Kent  
DA10 0DF

Tel: 01322 374660

Ref: 18379/A5/GC/v1

Fax: 01322 374661

Email: [gemma.care@bartonwillmore.co.uk](mailto:gemma.care@bartonwillmore.co.uk)

Date: November 2010

**COPYRIGHT**

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore LLP.

All Barton Willmore stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

## **CONTENTS**

### **PAGE NO.**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

**2.0 PROCEDURE**

**3.0 TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**4.0 LANDSCAPE**

**5.0 ECOLOGY**

**6.0 APPROACH TO PHASING**

**7.0 SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS TO DESIGN RELATED TEXT**

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These representations are submitted by Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd in response to the current consultation on the draft Whitfield Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd has land interests within the area of land at Whitfield allocated within the adopted Core Strategy for significant housing growth.
- 1.2 Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd have been actively involved with the proposals for the future growth of Whitfield for some time, including during the Core Strategy Examination. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy in February 2010, Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd and their appointed consultant team have had an integral role in taking the Whitfield Masterplan SPD forward.
- 1.3 Dover District Council's (DDC) adopted Core Strategy contains identifies Whitfield as a location for a major urban expansion. Paragraph 4.55 of the Core Strategy explains that the Whitfield Urban Extension (WUE) site offers the opportunity for a major sustainable expansion at Whitfield which would make the largest single contribution to realising the Strategy. The WUE site is confirmed as suitable to:

*...accommodate an expansion of around 5,750 new homes supported by a range of physical, social and green infrastructure, retail, small scale professional offices and other uses such as pubs, cafes and community facilities.*

- 1.3 The WUE SPD document aims to form a 'bridge' between the strategic allocation of Whitfield in the Core Strategy and the subsequent planning applications for development of the WUE site. Our position is that the SPD sets out a coherent and flexible vision for the future of an expanded Whitfield and provides guidance as to how development proposals within the allocated land should be carried out and managed.
- 1.4 Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd. and the development team has worked collaboratively with DDC, interested landowners, developers, the Parish Council, Whitfield Action Group and the Community Liaison Group via a workshop process since the adoption of the Core Strategy in February 2010 to produce the SPD for the wider masterplan area that is required by Policy CP11. The aim of the workshops was to develop and agree a vision for the WUE and steer the development of the master plan by engaging a wide range of individuals who were offered numerous opportunities to actively participate in the design process. An ongoing and wide ranging programme of public engagement facilitated by DDC and Phillip Jeans Homes

Ltd. ran alongside the masterplanning process and has been extremely influential in informing the contents of the consultation draft SPD.

- 1.5 As noted in paragraph 1.4 above, extensive ongoing consultation with a wide range of stakeholders has taken place throughout the development of the SPD; such stakeholders include Dover District Council (both Officers and Members), Kent Highway Services, Kent County Council, Natural England, Environment Agency, Whitfield Parish Council and the local community, in particular the Community Liaison Group (CLG). The CLG was founded specifically for the purposes of ensuring that the views of the community were properly represented during the workshop process and the input of the CLG members in this respect has been invaluable to the development of the consultation draft SPD.
- 1.6 These representations follow a thorough review of the consultation draft SPD by Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd's consultant team. Overall the representations set out our overarching support for the SPD in its current form, which has come about through a robust and transparent design and consultation process. There are areas which require minor amendment and/or clarification and these are set out within the relevant section of this document. Within these representations we look specifically at the following headline areas: Procedure; Highways and Transport; Landscape; Ecology; Approach to Phasing; Amendments to Design Text. We offer within each sections commentary on the content of the document in respect of each area and, where appropriate, specific amendments to wording.
- 1.7 Paragraph 1.19 of the draft SPD explains that comments can be made in respect of any part of the Masterplan and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment. DDC are however seeking views on the following six specific issues:
  1. Has the character of existing Whitfield been accurately assessed in Chapter 5?
  2. Have the right assessment criteria (Table 6.1) been identified?
  3. Are the development options, and the identification of Option E as the preferred option, reasonable (Chapter 7?)
  4. How well do the proposals safeguard existing Whitfield and the setting of the Listed Buildings?
  5. Has the Masterplan struck a reasonable balance between providing a firm framework for developing and considering planning applications, and the need for flexibility over a long implementation period?

1.8 No specific comment is made in respect of issues 1, 2 and 4 although amendments to text are suggested as part of these representations. A response to issue 3 is provided within Chapter 2 'Procedure'. In terms of issue 5 we confirm our position that the consultation draft masterplan does, subject to the minor amendments and points of clarification identified herein, strike a reasonable balance between providing a framework for planning applications and flexibility over a long implementation period.

## 2.0 PROCEDURE

- 2.1 When formally adopted, the Whitfield Masterplan SPD will form a 'bridge' between the strategic allocation of Whitfield in the Core Strategy DPD and the subsequent planning applications for development of the WUE site. It aims to set out a coherent and flexible vision for the future of an expanded Whitfield and provides guidance as to how development proposals within the allocated land should be carried out and managed. Subject to the amendments to points of detail set out within these representations, our position is that the SPD adequately fulfils this objective.
- 2.2 In terms of procedure, and the manner in which the SPD has been prepared over the course of the past 18 months, Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd considers that a robust and transparent process has been followed from the outset. Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd. and the development team has worked collaboratively with DDC, interested landowners, developers, the Parish Council, Whitfield Action Group and the Community Liaison Group via a workshop process since the adoption of the Core Strategy in February 2010 to produce the SPD for the wider masterplan area that is required by Policy CP11.
- 2.3 The aim of the workshops was to develop and agree a vision for the WUE and steer the development of the master plan by engaging a wide range of individuals who were offered numerous opportunities to actively participate in the design process. An ongoing and wide ranging programme of public engagement facilitated by DDC and Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd. ran alongside the master planning process and has been extremely influential in informing the contents of the consultation draft SPD.
- 2.3 The process that has been followed adheres with the guidance contained within Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning (PPS12) which, in considering the role of others in the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) states that '...where communities or developers which to use the statutory planning process (ie SPDs) as part of their approach, they should work with the local planning authority from the outset. Developers and communities should not expect to prepare plans independently of the LPA..'
- 2.4 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was undertaken for the SPD by Scott Wilson. Appendix 1 to the SA (The Legal Standing of this SA) explains that the WUE Masterplan SPD has been screened in as requiring an assessment under the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.

2.5 The SEA Directive states that:

**"...an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated" (Article 5.1).**

2.6 Information within the environmental report must include 'an outline of reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with'.

2.6 At this stage the LPA is expected to appraise **in broad terms** the effects of strategic options and then in more detail the effects of the preferred options when these have been selected. Guidance produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (formerly Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (2005) makes it clear that the LPA should development options '...working with the community and relevant stakeholders to achieve the objectives of the SPD'.

2.7 Through the workshop process a number of key options for developing the WUE area evolved and these are documented in sufficient detail within the Sustainability Appraisal and the consultation draft SPD. Appendix 11 to the guidance referred to in paragraph 2.6 above makes it clear that **only reasonable, realistic and relevant** options need to be put forward; some options will be discrete, involving choice between one option and another, while others can be combined in various ways.

2.8 The guidance explains that stakeholders '...may usefully be involved in the generation and assessment of both strategic and more detailed options through consultation...The options considered throughout the process must be documented and reasons given as to why they are or are not taken forward.' Our position is that a sufficient number of reasonable, realistic and relevant options for development of the WUE have been considered as part of the consultation and design process and that these options have been documented clearly and concisely both in the SA and SPD as well as in the Statement of Community Involvement which forms part of the SPD Evidence Base.

### **3.0 TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

- 3.1 The following comments and suggested amendments to the draft WUE SPD in respect of Transport and Infrastructure are provided by reference to the section of the draft SPD document to which they relate.

#### ***Section 6.5 – Utilities***

- 3.2 It is accepted that the majority of major utility upgrades will need to be delivered by early phases at WUE. The SPD should recognise this explicitly, and explain that the high costs of this will affect the ability of early phases to provide for other infrastructure / social housing. It should also recognise that later phases will benefit by not having the burden of infrastructure provision, and so overall the position can be managed such that at the end-state both infrastructure and other facilities have been delivered.

#### ***Section 6.10 – A256 Access***

- 3.3 The configuration of the access junction towards the southern end of the A256 is important – not only for the reasons stated in 6.11 of the SPD, but also because of the need to create a strong perception for residents that they are connected to Dover. In addition, as the majority of traffic from the new development areas has an origin or destination broadly to the south, a more southerly location for the access junction reduces overall journey distances and times.

#### ***Section 6.12 – First point of Access***

- 3.4 Providing the first point of access even further north on A256 (at Sandwich Road junction) would run counter to the desire lines of the majority of trips, which would have a southerly origin or destination. Hence, a northernmost first point of access would result in longer journey distances and times.

#### ***Section 6.15 – A256 Access***

- 3.5 The proposal for an at-grade roundabout option is supported.

### ***Section 6.18 – A2 Roundabout Location***

- 3.6 The proposed more easterly location of the A2 roundabout is supported. In transportation and movements terms, the location of the roundabout is not particularly sensitive in the context of A2 or development traffic. However, the location of the roundabout on the line of the former Nursery Lane / Green Lane alignment provides the opportunity to re-connect Whitfield and Temple Ewell with a formal pedestrian and cycle provision. This would re-establish the connection that existed before the A2 was built between the two communities, and their respective facilities.

### ***Section 6.20 – Sandwich Road Junction***

- 3.7 The overall approach is supported. It is likely that a proposal to increase capacity here early on in the development process may well prove counter-productive, as it may induce further rat-running through the existing Whitfield village, and increase pressure on the Whitfield roundabout approach from the village.

### ***Section 6.25 – Whitfield Roundabout***

- 3.8 It is suggested that the improvement of Whitfield roundabout should be planned in two phases – an early upgrade to partial traffic signal operation should be provided as part of the first phase of development. Further improvements, to increase the circulatory carriageway and re-configure the traffic signal control should then be triggered at a later point. The VISSIM model shows that the Whitfield roundabout is likely to continue to experience delays and queues in the end-state for development at 2031. There is limited scope to improve the roundabout further, and therefore the SPD should establish the principle for the investigation of a more comprehensive management strategy for this section of the A2 – between the new development access to the west and the A258 Duke of York's roundabout junction to the east. This strategy could include measures such as queue re-location and the provision of traffic signals on the A2 approaches to the section as a whole to allow all of the junctions on the section adjacent to Whitfield to be managed to their optimum efficiency.

### ***Section 6.31 – Napchester Road***

- 3.9 There is little potential to operate buses along Napchester Road, as it is very narrow on the section within the existing village. The SPD should recognise this, and propose the closure of this road to vehicles close to the line of the proposed site spine road. The connection for walking and cycling should be maintained.

### ***Section 6.32 – Singledge Lane***

- 3.10 In common with Napchester Road, there may not be a need for a bus gate proper on this route – this will depend on the viability of local services at the time, and the appetite of a bus company to operate in this area. However, it is suggested that the SPD retains the flexibility to make this provision, or close Singledge Lane at an appropriate point as circumstances dictate at the time when the planning application for development in this area comes forward in due course.

### ***Section 6.33 – Existing Village Roads***

- 3.11 The SPD should clarify that, with the exception of Sandwich Road, none of the existing village roads are really capable of taking additional traffic generated by development, and should be protected as such.

### ***Sections 6.36, 9.7, 9.8 & 9.9 – BRT***

- 3.12 The current economic conditions coupled with the proposals in the recent CSR mean that the local authorities may not be able to successfully promote their BRT scheme in and around Dover. This would have an adverse effect on WUE if BRT was not delivered, as the distance to Dover town centre facilities and Dover Priory rail station making walking unrealistic, and cycling less attractive. The SPD should therefore recognise that the delivery of a high-quality bus network for the WUE is important, whether or not this is provided by the BRT scheme.
- 3.13 The SPD should recognise that the WUE developments (through a suitable tariff mechanism) would be able to make funds available to provide a Whitfield – Dover – Station high-quality bus service in any event. Therefore, if BRT is able to be delivered, this resource should be targeted towards supporting and delivering the BRT scheme, but otherwise will be applied to the provision of a dedicated WUE high-quality bus network.
- 3.14 The SPD document should reflect this flexibility by changing references to “BRT” to “high-quality bus network / service / corridor” as appropriate.

### ***Section 6.43 – A2 Footbridge Link***

- 3.15 this is an important provision if it can be made – but the SPD should recognise that this cannot be delivered by developers as it relies on the availability of land on the southern side of the A2. The SPD should identify that the Council should give consideration to acquiring land on the southern side to allow this to be provided at an early stage.

***Sections 6.43 – Key Messages, & 9.11***

- 3.16 The delivery of three energy centres is the most appropriate response to the provision of sustainable energy at WUE at the time of the SPD. However, this position is likely to change, and will depend on the prevailing legislative position, the state of the energy market and the attractiveness of this and other options at the time. The aspiration for energy centres and sustainable energy provision is therefore supported, as is the need to ensure that land is provided to accommodate a suitable energy solution, but the SPD should provide flexibility that actual measures should be considered at each village stage as the context of energy provision is certain to change over the life of the WUE proposals.

***Section 10.2 – Phasing of Development***

- 3.17 The sequential delivery of villages is supported. The concept adopted by the SPD should seek to protect existing Whitfield residents by minimising development on multiple fronts. The way that the WUE development area encircles the existing Whitfield village could lead to high construction impacts if this is not carefully managed. It is suggested that individual “Village” phases should be substantially completed before successive phases commence, to allow development to “bed in” and create a scenario where construction impact in any existing location may be intensive for a defined period, but then moves away completely.

***Section 10.14***

- 3.18 The strategy for the initial access to be taken from the A256 is also supported for the reasons set out in section 6.10 of the SPD.

## 4.0 LANDSCAPE

- 4.1 The following comments and suggested amendments to the draft WUE SPD in respect of Transport and Infrastructure are provided by reference to the section of the draft SPD document to which they relate.

***P. 19, para 5.46***

- 4.2 Remove "the" after "themes".

***p. 19, para 5.48 and p. 21 "Landscape Conclusions"***

- 4.4 As previously highlighted: inconsistent presentation of the details of the three "landscape priorities". If they are to be packaged as "Landscape Conclusions", suggest that "character" bullet points are moved from para 5.48 to join those for "views" and "green infrastructure" within the Landscape Conclusions box, but including sub-headings for each of the three sets of points. Para 5.48 can then be deleted.

***p. 46, para 9.16***

- 4.5 The four GI types still are not presented consistently. There should be four bullet points to para 9.16. 4th bullet point should start "These corridors will expand into major open spaces in three locations." Text in the final three bullet points ("To the north-west of Church Whitfield..."; "In the centre of Napchester Valley..."; and "To the south of Lenacre Wood...") then follows as part of same bullet point.

***p. 44, Figure 9.3***

- 4.6 Potential pedestrian link to the south from Phase 1 of Site noted in the masterplan. This provision has been uncertain and was not included in GI Strategy plan. However, assuming situation remains that this will form part of the masterplan, this should be noted for inclusion in GI strategy Plan.

***p. 59, para 10.19***

- 4.7 *(with regard to the potential for Temple Whitfield (current Phase 5) coming before Lenacre Whitfield (current Phase 4) (See Section 5: Approach to Phasing):*

- 4.8 "Landscape Considerations" to be amended as follows:

*"In landscape terms, a sequential development of contiguous neighbourhoods will minimise potentially adverse landscape and visual effects by restricting construction activity at any one period of time to a single area rather than several, scattered around Whitfield. It will also ensure new areas of green infrastructure can be readily connected to the green infrastructure provided in the preceding phase and thereby form a logical contribution to the emerging overall GI network. This will produce commensurate benefits for accessibility, movement, landscape structure and habitat linkage. If circumstances dictate that this sequential approach cannot be followed (ie if a non-contiguous phase is brought forward in the development sequence) then it is suggested that Green Infrastructure connection(s) is (are) made to 'bridge' the gap that would otherwise be created, in order to secure these benefits."*

***Appendix 1, p.2 para 1.15***

- 4.9 (Further to GI revisions for agricultural viability) amend second sentence to say "Approximately 76.4ha would constitute natural..."

***Appendix 2, Infrastructure Requirements, Green Infrastructure section***

- 4.8 To be reviewed in light of ongoing DDC research on sports and play.

***Appendix 3, p.11, Principle WUE 9, Green Infrastructure, second bullet point***

- 4.9 Amend to: "Incorporate appropriate opportunities to include new Green Infrastructure which will promote a strong new landscape character, reflecting that of the surrounding area, with diverse landscape treatments and habitats within the broader structure."

***Appendix 3, p.11, Principle WUE 10, Public Realm Management***

- 4.10 Amend as follows (given suggestion below for Appendix 5):

*"Viable and integrated approaches to the management of all open space must be submitted as part of any development proposal for the WUE. Appendix 5 describes how strategic landscape management objectives for the WUE Green Infrastructure should be translated into landscape and biodiversity management strategy for each major phase and subsequently into detailed management plans for implementation through sub-phases. It addresses the scenario whereby certain areas of open space will be adopted by third parties (e.g. Parish Council or the Local Authority) and deals with the need for appropriate planning conditions*

*and obligations to secure coherent implementation and long term management of all open spaces.”*

**Appendix 4, p.22, para 4.30**

- 4.11 (Further to refinement of design on perimeter of school grounds within Phase 1a), amend to read:

*“Napchester Road follows the line of the ridge and for much of its length is open with no hedgerow. A broad verge with an avenue of structural trees should be provided on the south-eastern side between the edge of the existing village and the crossroads at Shepherd’s Cross, providing for pedestrian and cycle movement. A trimmed hedgerow with sparsely spaced canopy trees should be provided on the north-western side to contain the proposed school grounds and provide vertical accentuation of the ridgeline but enable views to the north and north-east. The viewing corridor from Napchester Road west of Shepherd’s Cross, looking north-east to the sea must be retained.”*

**Appendix 5, p.29, para 5.4**

- 4.12 After Noise Impact Assessment add bullet point “Public Realm and Open Space Strategy”.

**Appendix 5, p.30**

- 4.13 Remove paragraph 5.5 (“Open Space Strategy... ..) How vegetation will be managed to promote and enhance Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Value”) and insert the following under the next bullet point, “Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy”:

*“An extensive network of green infrastructure forms the setting of development at Whitfield, surrounding and permeating the proposed neighbourhoods. It is imperative for the ongoing amenity and effectiveness of the green infrastructure that its landscape and biodiversity components are managed appropriately and in an integrated way.*

*The **Green Infrastructure Strategy** for the masterplan area outlines the landscape and biodiversity MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES for four different Green Infrastructure (GI) Types. These objectives form the basis for a consistent and cohesive approach to management of Green Infrastructure across the masterplan area. The GI management of each of the five principal phases of the development must fit this overall approach. In turn, care must be taken to ensure that any subdivision into sub-phases does not lead to an inconsistency of management practices that could undermine these overall management objectives.*

Accordingly, **outline applications** for the development of each principal phase must be accompanied by a landscape and biodiversity MANAGEMENT STRATEGY that demonstrates how the overall landscape and biodiversity management objectives will be met within that phase. The management strategy document will detail the management prescriptions for the different landscape components of the phase, and will be accompanied by a plan that enables approximate areas of landscape maintenance works to be assessed.

To ensure that requisite standards and consistency are secured it is important that the organisation or organisations who will undertake these works is specified. Accordingly any grant of outline consent will, inter alia, be made subject to a **negative ('grampian') condition** that requires the applicant to submit to, and have approved by, Dover District Council before (X trigger point TBD), a document specifying the organisation(s) that will be responsible for landscape management in the area covered by the outline consent, and where there is more than one such organisation, specify clearly their respective responsibilities. Before the (y trigger point TBD) an **obligation under s106** will need to be entered into by the respective parties, to set out the nature of the on-going operations and their explicit relationship with the landscape and biodiversity management strategy for that phase."

## 5.0 ECOLOGY

- 5.1 This document sets out representations in respect of the Whitfield Urban Expansion Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Draft October 2010 in respect of biodiversity and ecological issues.
- 5.2 A special emphasis is placed on the adherence of the draft SPD to the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

### ***Section 4***

- 5.3 Section 4 of the SPD refers to the Habitat Regulations Assessment. In particular section 4.3 states that:

*“As part of an iterative approach, a Habitats Regulations Assessment of this SPD has been carried out which concludes that a number of elements of the WUE could, alone or (sic) combination, have indirect adverse effects on European sites. Given the long time scale over which development is to take place it is inappropriate to attempt to provide mitigation for the whole development at one time. The preferred approach is similar to that for the Dorset Heathlands, whereby an interim planning framework allows for a sequential provision of mitigation, together with testing of its effectiveness proportionate to the actual development and bespoke evidence gathering to further refine mitigation to inform a longer term, final framework”.*

- 5.4 It is considered that this is a wholly appropriate approach, although the following observations are pertinent in regard to ensuring that the SPD is Habitats Regulations compliant:

### ***Interim Mitigation Framework***

- 5.5 At the time of consultation the Interim Mitigation Framework is not available for comment. Hence, the detailed rationale for the compliance of the Interim Framework with the Habitats Regulations is not available. It is anticipated that as there is no evidence to suggest that Lydden & Temple Ewell SAC, or others, are currently experiencing significant effects, the SPD would conclude that initial development Phases at Whitfield are equally unlikely to give rise to significant effects and hence can safely proceed. However, so that a belt and braces approach is employed, it is anticipated that the SPD/Interim Mitigation Framework would

suggest that avoidance measures are put in place in any event from the outset of Phase 1 development.

- 5.6 Such avoidance measures should be informed by work undertaken to date and target any likely effects which could become significant as development continues across the latter Whitfield phases as well as effects which could combine in time with other development in the area to become significant. It is assumed that the content of the Interim Mitigation Framework will reflect that in the analysis tables of section 4 of the SPD, however, the exact content is yet to be made available and it is emphasised that this must be contained or referenced within the finalised SPD/Interim Mitigation Strategy.
- 5.7 It is considered this approach would be seen to be sound under the Habitats Regulations and mirrors the approach taken on the Dorset Heathlands referred to in the consultation draft of the SPD. However, by way of completeness, the rationale for adopting this particular approach is presently lacking from the consultation draft SPD and must be clearly explained within the final SPD/Interim Mitigation Strategy.
- 5.8 In addition, at the present time, it is unclear as to the mechanism, which will be secured under the SPD, by which mitigation will be brought forward. This must be set out clearly in the final SPD or Interim Mitigation Framework.

### ***Final Mitigation Framework***

- 5.9 Paragraph 4.3 of the consultation draft of the SPD sets out that "The preferred approach is similar to that for the Dorset Heathlands, whereby an interim planning framework allows for a sequential provision of mitigation, together with testing of its effectiveness proportionate to the actual development and bespoke evidence gathering to further refine mitigation to inform a longer term, final framework".
- 5.10 However, the SPD does not discuss the final framework beyond this statement. The Interim Mitigation Framework is not available and hence this cannot be consulted as to whether this contains any more detail in regard to the Final Mitigation Framework.
- 5.11 It is emphasised that the SPD must consider the deliverability of the Final Mitigation Framework. The SPD considers the totality of the development at Whitfield (i.e. all phases) and hence in order to be in line with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, it is essential that the SPD considers the deliverability of the Final Mitigation Framework.

- 5.12 In order for the SPD to comply with the Regulations, it must be shown beyond reasonable scientific doubt that significant effects on European (Natura 2000) sites can be avoided. In this regard the ability of the Final Mitigation Strategy to deliver the required mitigation measures must be assured. The SPD must demonstrate how this assurance will be provided.
- 5.13 It is our view that the effects identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment, summarised in Table 4.1 of the SPD, can be readily mitigated by the measures proposed in the same Table. In addition, monitoring data obtained from the implementation of the early mitigation measures will allow their effectiveness to be fully defined while any further evidence base available at the time will also be able to be fed into the Final Mitigation Framework.
- 5.14 Accordingly, the Final Mitigation Framework will allow avoidance measures to be optimised to offset effects arising.
- 5.15 Effects arising primarily relate to the potential for increased visitor usage of Natura 2000 sites. A suite of options are available to offset any such effects, with those of which are considered necessary to proportionately offset effects being outlined within Table 4.1 of the SPD. However, within these measures a range of sub-options are in turn available, as to how best to manage visitor access, and it is the use of this range of sub-options (see examples at the **Appendix 1** to these representations) that the Final Mitigation Strategy should seek to optimise.
- 5.16 On the data available to date, to achieve the required mitigation, it is clear that it will be necessary to implement only a small proportion of the available measures. Accordingly, in our view, the effectiveness of the ability of the Final Mitigation Strategy to deliver the required mitigation is assured and hence the SPD, subject to amendment to reflect the comments above, would be Habitats Regulations compliant.

## 6.0 APPROACH TO PHASING

### *Neighbourhood Principles*

- 6.1 The principle of distinct neighbourhoods is central to the vision and design approach to the WUE. It is fundamental to gaining the support of residents. The protection of the character and identity of existing Whitfield was key factor coming out of the initial public consultation.
- 6.2 Each neighbourhood will be smaller than the existing village, thus Whitfield retains its historic status. Neighbourhoods will have their own character and identity due to their specific landscape character, topography and because of timing.

### *Phasing*

- 6.3 Each neighbourhood must be substantially complete before the next neighbourhood can commence. Phase 1 is the logical first phase because:
- Access from the A256 is deliverable earlier than the A2 because of policy and consent issues;
  - It is the natural location for an access point;
  - The access point can be achieved at grade;
  - It can be brought forward with out impact on the existing village approach to the Whitfield roundabout;
  - It can support the delivery requirements of infrastructure;
  - Its proximity and alignment to Dover.
- 6.4 Earlier concerns regarding linking Phase 1 and 1a have been overcome by providing the first new school within Phase, in response to public consultation.
- 6.4 The Phase 1a provides early facilities to existing residents in a location that is right now and in the end state, including;
- Food and other retail;
  - Small business;
  - Medical centre;
  - Learning and Communities Campus.

- 6.5 There is no logic in splitting a neighbourhood, it would only lead to fragmented and adhoc development.
  
- 6.6 Phases 3, 4 & 5 are dependant on the delivery of the A2 junction. If the A2 comes forward early Phases 4 & 5 could be reversed without undermining the phasing intent. Movement and ecology, which are key constraints can support both strategies.

## **7.0 SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS TO DESIGN RELATED TEXT**

### ***Introduction –p3, para 1.6***

- 7.1 Second sentence to be corrected. The masterplan is formed of six main areas not three.

### ***Context – p.6***

- 7.2 Point vii should be amended to read:

*'The design creates neighbourhood centres, incorporates landmark buildings and foreground buildings and creates vistas and focal points using retained trees, having particular .....*

### ***Whitfield Today – p.17, para 5.17/5.18***

- 7.3 Refers to Western Edge duplication of text 5.20.

### ***Page 18 - Urban Design Conclusions***

- 7.4 Point 2 should be amended to read:

*'...the historic built form was subsumed within modern....'*

- 7.5 Point 7 should be amended to read:

*'...take account of the street....'*

### ***Page 21/22, para. 5.55/5.56/5.57***

- 7.6 Listed Buildings duplication of text 5.52

### ***Development Area – p.25, para 6.1***

- 7.7 Bullet point 2 should be amended to read:

*'Changing policies and regulations may affect type, style, layout of urban design in phases as they progress.'*

Page 25, para. 6.3

- 7.8 Refers to modern/innovative design solutions. The term 'modern/innovative' seems to be a stylistic suggestion. Up until this point there has been no other reference to style other than the outcome of the public consultation on page 8. There is no proscription of innovation in the document. This style direction is included in a number of places below that suggests that it is an 'agenda'. This would be wholly inappropriate at several levels. Stylistic direction is not in accordance with PPS1, paragraph 38 and should be omitted. In this instance the text should be amended to read:

*'.....changes to the Building Regulations which could bring forward design solutions which need to be accommodated within the principles included in the SPD.'*

***Page 27 - Fig 6.1 Infrastructure Diagram***

- 7.9 To be updated latest version PBA

***Page 28, para 6.10***

- 7.10 First sentence states ' The location of the A256 junction is not constrained or dictated by transport considerations, but has been led by the masterplanning exercise.'
- 7.11 The reverse is the case, the masterplan has been led and informed by the location of the A256 junction and its advantages are set out in 6.11 and 6.15. The problems associated with junction at any other points are set out 6.12.

***Page 31, para 6.31***

- 7.12 The nature of Napchester Road does not make it suitable as a bus route. The term 'bus gate', particularly with regard Napchester Road has led to confusion. PBA to advise on amended wording.

***Page 32/33, para 6.37***

- 7.13 Bullet point 1 & 3 – buses will use normal carriageway, the route will only be a dedicated bus lane and the junction to the A256 near the A2 roundabout.

***Page 33, 6.38 - 42***

- 7.14 These paragraphs are potentially confusing. Does text reflect proposals? PBA to advice.

***Page33***

- 7.15 Key messages arising from points 4 and 7 are repeated.

***The Concept Masterplan - Page 41 - Whitfield Development Objectives***

- 7.16 Point 3 should read:

*'The development should create a new housing offer for Dover with an emphasis on family housing'*

- 7.17 Point 4 should read:

*'In order to reduce disruption to the existing residents and ensure cohesive development during the lifetime of the plan, each phase .....'*

***Page 42 -Fig 9.1 Concept Masterplan Diagram***

- 7.18 Latest plan shows energy centre 2a (EC2a) – Fig 9.1 needs updating.

***Page 45, 9.9***

- 7.19 Bullet points 1 to 5 repeat 6.37, see comments above.

***Page 47, 9.21***

- 7.20 As page 25 6.3 the last sentence the term 'innovative form' seems to be stylistic and should be omitted. In this context text should be amended to read:

*'This provides a unique opportunity for distinctive design'*

***Extensions to Whitfield - Extension adjacent Newlands - Page 48, para 9.34***

7.21 Fourth sentence should read:

*'The new development would take account of the built form, scale and street pattern of the existing adjacent development area and changing priorities in respect of street types and layout'*

***Extension to the south east of Napchester Road – P49, para 9.36***

7.22 Third sentence should read:

*'The built form, street pattern and layout could take account of the adjoining existing Whitfield.....'*

***Extension between Sandwich Road and Napchester Road: New District Centre - p49, para 9.39***

7.23 The precise requirements for the new centre at this time are not known so the first line should read:

*'The new centre can provide'*

***Page 49, para 9.41***

7.24 Third sentence we do not see how a landmark feature can be 'necessary' and suggest this is reworded 'desirable'.

***Page 49/50, para 9.41 – 9.49***

7.25 These paragraphs seem to refer to an imaginary design and are inappropriately specific for a consultation document. All points should be generic as designs that come forward will be subject to further analysis that may or may not confirm these conclusions.

***Page 49, para 9.42***

- 7.26 It is not a necessary condition that buildings should graduate in accordance with topography; there may be a contrary case. This would be subject to analysis at detailed design stage. This paragraph should be omitted.

***Page 49, para 9.43***

- 7.27 This suggests that the uses on the Green should be exclusively non-residential at ground floor level. This may not be appropriate. The third sentence should read:

*'Ground floor accommodation onto the Green could be used for additional retail or employment uses.'*

***Page 49/50, para 9.44***

- 7.28 This presumes that there will be a medical centre, which is by means certain. The paragraph is both inappropriately specific and too discursive. This paragraph should be omitted.

***Page 50, para 9.45***

- 7.29 This is a very detailed design specification. It should be generic until such time as an application comes forward with appropriate analysis. It is axiomatic that all new proposals must take into account the amenity of existing properties. Most of this paragraph serves no purpose except to confirm usual planning standards or describe an imaginary scheme. The last sentence does not belong with the rest of the paragraph and should stand alone.

- 7.30 A general paragraph regarding the landscape buffer and relationship with existing properties could be added either before or after page 48, 9.34, as below:

*'The landscape buffer of connecting parks proposed between the existing village and the new neighbourhoods will do much to protect residential amenity within adjacent properties. Existing residential properties adjacent to the extensions will not receive the benefit of these substantial landscaped areas. Therefore, detailed consideration of layout and planting within the extensions must explicitly address and minimise the likely adverse effects on residential amenity for existing properties adjacent to the extensions.'*

***Page 50, para 9.46***

- 7.31 This is inappropriately specific about parking arrangements. This would be subject to further analysis. From the second sentence, this should read:

*'Dominance of parked cars should be avoided and commercial, public-use and private parking should be provided in a co-ordinated manner.'*

***Page 50, para 9.47***

- 7.32 This is both proscriptive and discursive and adds nothing of any significance. It should be omitted.

***Page 50, para 9.48***

- 7.33 Whitfield generally is made up of pockets of quite different character. There is no compelling reason why this substantial new and quite different area should specifically relate typologically to existing adjacent buildings. Indeed, a case could be made to the contrary on density alone. It is also axiomatic in any planning application that regard be given to topography and the character of the street scene. This paragraph should be omitted.

***Page 50, para 9.49***

- 7.34 Wording is clumsy. Objective is to encourage permeability.

***New Neighbourhoods***

- 7.35 On individual phases a significant amount of design proscription has been added, going to a surprisingly fine level of detail. We would not normally expect this level of detail without significant further analysis. Without any such analysis, this detail may well prove to be inappropriate or may constrain the best layout when detailed plans are prepared. It should be removed or backed up with analysis or put into more generic form. We will go through the key paragraphs in turn.

***Page 51, para 9.57***

- 7.36 As Page 25, 6.3 above. There is no preclusion of "innovative" design, layout, street pattern or form and to specify these assumes that there is and could be taken as a style directive to applicants. This should be reworded:

*'There are opportunities for new neighbourhoods to develop their own characteristics through distinctive layout, street pattern and form provided there is a satisfactory relationship with other development and the aspirations of residents.'*

Light Hill

**Page 51, para 9.67**

- 7.37 The description of the quantum of development needs to be tested through detail design. Suggest the imperative 'will' needs to be replaced with the conditional 'can'. Second sentence should read:

*'This neighbourhood can provide approximately 1400 dwellings, including a care home'*

**Page 51, para 9.69**

- 7.38 First sentence suggest the following rewording:

*'Substantial landscaping to the embankment...'*

**Page 51, para 9.70**

- 7.39 This is too prescriptive. First and Second sentences should read;

*'A local centre can be located at the intersection of the primary street as it moves north to Archer's Court Road and route for the Bus Rapid Transit/bus. This area can have the ....'*

**Page 51/52, para 9.77**

- 7.40 The reference to density is too prescriptive. Third sentence to read;

*'The character of the south east area could be defined by lower densities interwoven with landscape. Landmarks could take the form of ....'*

**Page 52, para 9.78**

- 7.41 As page 25, 6.3 above. This should be deleted. Appropriate innovation is available throughout the plan.

**Page 52, para 9.79**

7.42 The existing trees are Corsican Pines not Scots Pines.

***Page 52, 9.81***

7.43 Bullet point 2. This clause is repeated in several places in relation to the land adjacent to the A256. It may be correct but there may be other ways of dealing with these boundary conditions. We suggest:

*'Boundary conditions with the A256 should be considered together with landscaping, visual impact and individual amenity to create a satisfactory edge to development.'*

7.44 Bullet point 8. A gateway may be appropriate but in fact Elm Farm House would perform this function. We see no need for this point.

Parsonage Whitfield

***Page 52, para 9.86***

7.45 First sentence to read:

*'Church Whitfield Road should be protected and enhanced where possible.'*

***Page 52, para 9.87***

7.46 This is too prescriptive and should read;

*'Significant tree planting will be carried out along Archer's Court Road. Buildings will be set back, to retain the rural character of the road.'*

***Page 52, para 9.89***

7.47 This is a description of a design, not general guidance, and is inappropriate in an SPD.

7.48 Final sentence suggest wording is changed to read:

*'The area adjacent to Church Whitfield is informal, of lower density, not uniform and can comprise dwellings predominately detached in larger plots.'*

***Page 52, para 9.90***

- 7.49 Third sentence. As 9.67 suggest the imperative 'will' is replaced with the conditional 'can'.

***Page 53, para 9.94***

- 7.50 Third sentence is clumsy, its meaning is unclear and should be deleted.
- 7.51 Fourth sentence; '..... opportunity for the meshing of architectural styles and spatial layout ....' Meshing what with what? This sentence has no useful meaning and should be omitted.

***Page 53, para 9.95***

- 7.52 Final sentence. As 9.67 suggest the imperative 'will' is replaced with the conditional 'can'.

***Page 53, para 9.97***

- 7.53 Apart from general points about tree planting, this is not very clearly worded and seems too specific in content for a SPD.

***Page 53, para 9.98 and 9.99***

- 7.54 This is a description of a design of a particularly specific form and includes a description of a modification to the plan, which is contradictory and inappropriate. We suggest this is limited to a wish to maintain the rural character of the cross roads. In this and other paragraphs there are notes requiring lower densities without a recognition of the relatively high densities in the development generally, given its rural location, and the consequent higher density required as compensation.
- 7.55 Through careful analysis and design it is likely that there will be ways that development will be able to front Church Whitfield Road and Napchester Road and protect its rural character. An approach has been suggested in the Design Codes. To have backs of properties onto these roads would be unacceptable.

***Page 54, para 9.101***

- 7.56 Bullet point 3. See 9.81, bullet point 2, above.

Napchester Whitfield

***Page 54, para 9.102***

- 7.57 It may be correct that the primary street can not run along the ridgeline but without further detailed analysis it can not be stated with any certainty. There are local examples of roads running quite successfully along ridgeline and that may also be appropriate in this case. Fourth and Fifth sentences should be deleted.

***Page 54, para 9.104***

- 7.58 Final sentence. As 9.67 suggest the imperative 'will' is replaced with the conditional 'can'.

***Page 54, para 9.105***

- 7.59 This is too prescriptive. Second sentence should read;

*'Its character can be defined by....'*

***Page 54, para 9.106***

- 7.60 This point does not seem to make sense. In this and other paragraphs there are very unclear descriptions of particular areas.

***Page 54, para 9.107***

- 7.61 Without further detailed analysis this is too specific at this stage and should be deleted.

***Page 54, para 9.108***

- 7.62 Final sentence, as Page 25, 6.3 above. Omit sentence.

***Page 54, para 9.109***

- 7.63 The principle of graduated development from centre to edge may not be universally appropriate and need not be included here. Sentence should be deleted.

**Page 54, 9.112**

- 7.64 Bullet point 2. See 9.81, bullet point 2, above.

Lenacre Whitfield

**Page 55/56, para 9.117**

- 7.65 Third sentence requires greater clarification to avoid back gardens facing the road. Suggest text is changed to:

*'Development will be set back behind a wide verge and tree avenue with a footpath/cycleway between the trees and the buildings. Buildings will front the street but vehicular access to these buildings will be from the rear.'*

**Page 55, para 9.118**

- 7.66 The first and second sentences are not very clearly worded and can be omitted and the third sentence amended:

*'In terms of development this area may be capable of being.....'*

- 7.67 Final sentence. As 9.67 suggest the imperative 'will' is replaced with the conditional 'can'.

**Page 55, 9.119**

- 7.68 The school is not positioned on the new primary street but should be accessed via it and not Singledge Lane. Second sentence to should read:

*'The school will be accessed via the new primary route.'*

**Page 55, para 9.120**

- 7.69 The local centre is positioned east of the new primary street adjacent the school. Sentence should read:

*'A local centre could be located to the east of ....'*

***Page 55, para 9.122***

- 7.70 Fourth sentence. As page 25, 6.3. This should be omitted. This is a very clear style directive.
- 7.71 Bullet point 4. See 9.81, bullet point 2, above

Temple Whitfield

***Page 56, para 9.124***

- 7.72 The diversion of the PROW at Temple Whitfield must not be a precondition; potentially it can not be delivered. The final sentence should read:

*'To protect the visual amenity of the residents of Temple Farm the opportunity to divert the existing PROW should be explored'*

***Page 56, para 9.125***

- 7.73 As page 55, 9.117. Third sentence requires greater clarification to avoid back gardens facing the road.
- 7.74 Final sentence. As 9.67 suggest the imperative 'will' is replaced with the conditional 'can'.

***Page 56, para 9.126***

- 7.75 Third sentence. As page 25, 6.3. If the general point is to be followed, 'innovative' could be substituted with 'distinctive', which has no style implication.

***Page 56, para 9.127***

- 7.76 This paragraph is unnecessary if the word 'innovative' is excluded from paragraph 9.126.

***Page 56, para 9.130***

- 7.77 Bullet point 4. See 9.122 above.

***Delivery and Implementation***

**Page 57, Fig 10.1**

- 7.78 Proposed Phasing Diagram – should be updated Phase 1a and 1b are part of the same phase.

**Page 58, para 10.11**

- 7.79 Delivery of below 240 dwellings a year should not be a trigger for starting a new neighbourhood. Each neighbourhood should be substantially complete before the commencement of the neighbourhood. The first sentence should be amended to read:

*'Each neighbourhood must be substantially complete occupied prior to the commencement of the next neighbourhood.'*

Appendix 2 Infrastructure Requirements

- 7.80 The provision of a youth centre, adult education, adult social services, health care provision and children's social services are not finally established as necessary or achievable, in all cases the imperative "will" needs to be replaced with the conditional "can".

Appendix 3 Expanded Whitfield Principles

**Appendices, Page 12 - Principle WUE 5, final bullet point.**

- 7.81 There is a case for a distinctive rather than a gradual transition from built form to open countryside, but probably not in all cases. Indeed, some of the plan quite specifically proposes such a hard edge in relation to linking spaces. The second sentence seems to imply this but contradicts that first and last sentence. This should be reworded:

*'The transition from open to built space can be gradual or clearly defined and should be examined on a case-by-case basis. Generally, where space is enclosed or there are movement, geographic or landscape edge-definitions in place or planned, a more clear-cut transition between open and built space may be appropriate. Transition to open countryside is generally more appropriate with mixed landscape and building to create a more graduated edge condition. However, extensive and dense ridgetop/valley flank woodland and tree belts are characteristic of the area and would form an appropriate edge to the development where such features are indicated in the Green Infrastructure Strategy Plan.'*

7.82 Principle WUE 7, third sentence '.... must be of a high quality and design'. What does this mean? Should all development be of a high quality and design?

## APPENDIX 1

## **Whitfield – options for reducing effects of recreational access**

**Lydden and Temple Ewell Downs SAC/NNR.** Management options include:

- Increased wardening
- Introduction of enhanced signage, way-marking and suggested routes away from sensitive areas
- Introduction of additional fencing
- Introduction of planting e.g. hedgerows, to guide visitor movements
- Stopping advertising of site on NE and KWT websites as well as elsewhere
- Charging for car parking
- Restricting or closing nature reserve car park
- Un-designating NNR
- Enforcing Schedule 2 of CRoW Act (dogs on short lead in vicinity of livestock)
- Restricting CRoW access on basis of nature conservation concerns
- Seasonal or permanent closure of a number of selected access points
- Surfacing of sections of routes
- Diverting footpaths
- Closure of footpaths

**Dover to Kingsdown Cliffs SAC.** Management options include:

- Increased wardening
- Introduction of enhanced signage
- Introduction of additional fencing
- Introduction of planting e.g. hedgerows, to guide visitor movements
- Reduce non-NT car parking (although very limited already, at least at Dover end)
- Reduce advertising on tourist websites
- Seasonal or permanent closure of a number of selected access points
- Introduce other access restrictions on non-NT land under CRoW
- Further access management undertaken by NT to maintain favourable condition of SSSI
- Increase cost of car parking for non-NT members

**Sandwich Bay SAC – Dune habitat;**

**Thanet Bay SAC Reefs and sea caves (unlikely affected by coastal visitors)**

**Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar – primarily wintering birds**

Management options include:

- Increased wardening
- Introduction of enhanced signage
- Introduction of additional fencing
- Introduction of planting e.g. hedgerows, to guide visitor movements
- Restricting parking / increasing charges if applicable
- Closing or diverting footpaths
- By-laws to restrict dogs
- Fencing (dune areas, possibly temporary fencing of sections of beach for winter)
- Education / management of dog walkers
- Establishment of honeypots in non-sensitive areas to attract visitors away from more sensitive locations. Examples include viewing decks or a visitor centre.

