

Langdon Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

The Regulation 16 consultation was held between 23 June 2025 and 4 August 2025. Six responses were received during this time, as detailed in the table of contents below.

Environment Agency	<p>No specific comments were made but general advice was provided.</p> <p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/Environment-Toolkit-20181220.pdf</p> <p>We also recommend your Plan takes account of relevant Local Planning Authority's policies, plans and strategies including Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, flood risk strategies, the South East River Basin Management Plan, Thames River Basin Management Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Information was provided to explain the key issues considered in reviewing a Neighbourhood Plan. The aim was to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment.</p>
Historic England	<p>We do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you if appropriate to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>The comments submitted by Historic England during the Regulation 14 Consultation were as follows:</p> <p>The Draft Plan's heritage and design policies are exceptionally well-considered and as such we are content for the Plan to proceed to formal submission without further comment from ourselves.</p>

Natural England	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Other general information was also provided.</p>
Southern Water	<p>Our comments at Regulation 14 stage did include a request to refer to Southern Water's 'SuDS within SPZ guidance' developed to help protect groundwater to drinking water standards in sensitive Source Protection Zones. Whilst this is not a legal requirement or one that indicates non-compliance with the basic conditions, it would help make both Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies on SuDS more effective in this sensitive area. Much of Langdon parish overlies Source Protection Zones (SPZ) – groundwater sources from which public drinking water supplies are drawn. As drinking water standards are more stringent than the environmental standards more often referred to in SuDS guidance for the protection of groundwater, Southern Water has developed additional guidance for SuDS within SPZ. This guidance explains when we will ask developers to provide a full hydrogeological risk assessment of the site to inform their SuDS design proposals - please see this link for more information:</p> <p>https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/ooubtggs/suds-in-spz-guidance.pdf.</p> <p>The Southern Water response related to the main neighbourhood development plan document and the Design Guide parts 4 and 5.</p>
Resident	<p>I object to the affordable housing.' Affordable' was defined as current market value which is only affordable to a few. The community needs social housing for families and retirees. I object to the orange and black houses proposed in the plan. I support the rest of the plan: green spaces, well-kept verges, speed limits...</p>
Dover District Council	<p>Overall, the council supports the content of the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan. However, there are some remaining concerns with regards to whether all parts of the Plan, or policies within it, are in general conformity with national or local policy. We do consider that with some minor modifications, these issues can be resolved, and we have included proposed amendments to wording where we consider this would assist the Parish Council and Examiner.</p>

		Officers have also suggested some wording amendments which we consider would add to the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan policies, and comments on the Design Guidance and Codes supporting document. Please see the attached schedule of comments.
Section/ Para/ Page	Chapter/ Policy/Topic	Dover District Council comments/recommendations
Para 1.8	Introduction	<p>Update references to Development Plan for conformity with Local Policy</p> <p>The Development Plan for Dover District should include the Kent Mineral Sites Plan 2020 as well as the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2024 to 2039 (2025). Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (KMWLP) - Kent County Council</p>
Policy L1	Location of Development	<p>Amendments to Policy text suggested for effectiveness and conformity with National and Local Policy</p> <p>Reference to traffic management should be omitted from iii the principal concern should be the appropriate conservation of the heritage asset itself and then add traffic flows to criterion iv.</p> <p>Suggested text A iii: <u>"where appropriate, bring redundant or vacant agricultural/farm buildings and/or heritage assets back into viable use consistent with their conservation in a manner that does not cause harm in terms of additional traffic;"</u> to be consistent with NPPF (para 203 d).</p> <p>Suggested text to A iv: <u>"it is capable of connecting to the primary movement network hierarchy (see Policy L12),and will not lead to unacceptable impacts on highway safety". To be consistent with NPPF para 116.</u></p> <p>It is also suggested that a cross reference to Local Plan Policy H2 - Rural Local Needs Housing is made within criterion C of this policy.</p>

Policy L3	Character and design of development	<p>Amendment to policy text Criterion A required for general conformity. The Government has recently published guidance (December 1024) on a new protected landscapes duty: <u>Guidance for relevant authorities on seeking to further the purposes of Protected Landscapes - GOV.UK</u>. The final sentence of criteria A should state: '.... or minimises any adverse impacts on the <u>natural beauty, special qualities and key characteristics of the setting</u> of the Kent Downs National Landscape through development in its setting.'</p> <p>Amendment to policy test Criterion B suggested for effectiveness and conformity with national policy. Planning Policy Framework (NPPF para 134) requires <u>all</u> development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area. Delete 'Innovation in design ...' and the replace with '<u>Development</u>'</p> <p>Amendment to Criterion C (i) suggested for effectiveness. Please be aware that such a list can become out of date or leave out important guidance documents (such as the Kent Downs <u>Landscape-Design-Handbook.pdf</u> which is currently being amended). As such, it is better in supporting text. Alternatively state that '<u>development proposals will be expected to have regard to relevant national and local design guidance and codes, including...</u>'.</p> <p><i>Please also refer to the final comment in this schedule in relation to the content of the Design Guidance and Code which is referenced in Policy L3, and factual or content issues.</i></p> <p>Amendment to policy text Criterion C(v) required for conformity with national policy. The text: '<i>does not adversely affect vehicular and pedestrian safety</i>' is not consistent with the NPPF (para 115/116). This criterion should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>Criterion D Observation/correction – DDC consider the reference to Policy PM2 of the Local Plan to be incorrect and should be replaced with Policy PM1.</p> <p>Amendment to paragraph 6.13 recommended for conformity with the Local Plan and effectiveness. At end of paragraph insert the following: '<u>Further detail on surface water</u></p>
-----------	-------------------------------------	---

		<p>management and the drainage hierarchy are available at Policy CC6 of the Dover District Local Plan'.</p> <p>Amendment to Policy Footnote recommended: Conformity references at the end of the policy should include Local Plan Policies CC6, NE2 and HE1.</p>
Policy L4	Energy efficiency and design	<p>Removal of Criterion C recommended for conformity with Local Plan.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy HE1 already deals with matters relating to retrofitting of energy efficiency measures in heritage assets. If minded to retain criterion (c) in Policy L4, it could be amended as follows:</p> <p>Suggested text: <u>Proposals for retrofitting heritage assets (including buildings within conservation areas) with measures to improve energy efficiency must be informed by an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset. An application must demonstrate the 'whole house approach' has been followed. Proposals will normally be supported provided the significance of the heritage asset is conserved.</u></p> <p>Amendment to Policy Footnote recommended: Add reference to Local Plan Policy HE2</p>
Policy L5	Renewable and community energy	<p>Amendment to policy text Criterion A(i) required for effectiveness and conformity with Local Policy. Criterion A(i) should also refer to Kent Downs AONB Landscape Character Assessment Update 2020¹ and the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan (as updated). This is because land within the Kent Downs National Landscape is omitted from the Dover Landscape Assessment and the Management Plan is the Statutory Guidance document. The words '(as updated)' should also be included after the reference to Kent Downs National Landscape Renewable Energy Statement, because it is currently under review.</p>

¹ [NEEB09a Kent Downs AONB LCA 1.0-Introduction_FINAL](#)[NEEB09b Kent Downs AONB LCA 4.0-1C_East-Kent-Downs_FINAL](#), [NEEB09c Kent Downs , AONB LCA 8.0-3A_White-Cliffs-Coast_FINAL](#).

		<p>Amendment to policy text Criterion A(v) recommended for conformity with National Policy. It should be amended to state ‘....how the applicant has <u>sought to</u> avoided land with a high potential for agriculture’ The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (paragraphs 2.10.28 – 2.10.34) gives further information on the impact of BMV agricultural land in decision-making. This document is currently under review.</p> <p>Amendment to Policy Footnote recommended: Add reference to policy NE2</p>
Policy L6	Conserving heritage assets	<p>Amendment to Policy recommended for conformity with National and Local Policy:</p> <p>Deletion of Criterion A, B, D and E is suggested as these points are already covered by relevant policies in the Local Plan and the NPPF and having duplicated policies can lead to uncertainty of application at decision making stages.</p> <p>If Criteria A, B, D and E are retained, we make the following comments:</p> <p>Amendment to policy text A recommended: add the following text “<u>the list is not exhaustive, and other buildings, structures and sites may be identified as non-designated heritage assets, for example during the determination of a planning application.</u>”</p> <p>Amendment to policy text B and ii required: replace “conservation <i>and</i> enhancement” with “conservation <i>or</i> enhancement” to be consistent with legislation.</p> <p>Amendment to policy text B iv required: remove “setting of the areas” to be consistent with legislation.</p> <p>Amendment to Policy Footnote recommended: Add reference to policy HE2</p>
Policy L8	The natural environment and biodiversity	<p>Amendment to Policy recommended for conformity with National and Local Policy:</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain requirements are substantially set out in legislation and Government practice guidance. The Council make the following suggestions:</p>

		<p>Amendment to policy text Criterion A required for conformity with National Policy. The final sentence of criterion A should be deleted. The minimum 10% BNG is a legal requirement (unless the development is exempt) such that the planning balance is not relevant in the matter of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p>Criteria A Note: Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 74-005-20240214) makes the following statement:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified. To justify such policies they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development.”</p> <p>DDC officers note that the 20% reference in Policy L8 is an ‘aim’ rather than a requirement, but it would be helpful to include further information on how this should be resourced (suitable land in the Parish, such as habitat banks). It is noted that the higher net gain target is focused on major development.</p> <p>Amendment to Criterion C recommended. The reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas is likely to become obsolete in the near future. This is because the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS, currently in draft form) will be finalised imminently. Effectively this will replace the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. Reference to the emerging LNRS could be included here by way of footnote, to ensure the NP remains up to date when the changes come into effect.</p> <p>Criteria G Note: the Local Plan has a detailed tree policy (CC8) which seeks the planting of two trees per new dwelling. Although Policy L8 has a slightly different emphasis, the Council considers that there may be some conflict with the trees and woodland section of Policy L8.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Note: The Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is expected to be published in Autumn 2025, following public consultation in January 2025. The strategy will set out the priorities for nature recovery and the recommended actions to deliver these. It will include an online map which identifies the most valuable existing areas for nature and also maps proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environmental goals. LNRS's were introduced by the Environment Act 2021 and Local Planning Authorities must have regard to them when determining planning applications. It may be helpful to reference this in the NP.</p> <p>Amendment to Policy Footnote recommended: Add reference to policy NE2</p>
Appendix B:	Non-Designated Heritage Assets	<p>Recommendation for effectiveness: It is the councils view that the text does not provide robust evidence why these should be considered NDHA. The NP may wish to use the criteria set out in the appendices of the 2015 Land Allocation Plan as this will be used to formulate the proposed new SPD noted in the Local Plan to explain the reasons for each NDHA. .</p>
Appendix D	Locally Significant Views	<p>Amendment recommended for effectiveness and conformity with Local Plan:</p> <p>The description of V5: View south from high point towards the Kent Downs should be amended as follows to remove potential conflict with Local Plan housing site allocation SAP46:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> remove the text referring to “the footpath to the left is to be retained” as the route is not a Public Right of Way (PRoW) and the community’s desire for a link in the vicinity between PRoW ER44 and ER45 is captured in Policy L12 supporting paragraph 9.9. remove the text referring to “and this view corridor should be protected” which is overly prescriptive given the flexible general approach to impacts from development on locally significant views as set out in Policy L10 supporting paragraph 8.24, which specifically mentions the allocated site.
Design Guidance and Code		
<p>This document does not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan but does inform it and is expected to be used to inform decisions as set out in Paragraph 6.9 of the NP.</p>		

"The Langdon Design Guidance and Codes form an integral part of the LNP and underpin Policy L3 to support the creation of distinctive places that are well-integrated with the existing settlements in the parish and to promote high-quality and popular built forms. The Guidance should be applied to all development proposals in the parish including the strategic site allocation".

And Policy L3: Character and Design of Development Part C:

"As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate how they have sought to address the following matters: i. the Langdon Design Guidance and Codes, the Kent Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, the Kent Downs Management Plan and the management principles of the Dover District Landscape Character Assessment (Landscape Character Area F3 Ripple);"

Therefore, officers have provided comments and suggestions to ensure that the Design Guidance and Codes is accurate and can be used effectively when implementing Policy L3 in decision making, as set out below:

1. Langdon Design Guidance and Codes Section 1.3 - Planning policy and design guidance

For clarity, we recommend the following amendments to the Local Policy section on page 10:

- a) removing the section on the Core Strategy as this was replaced in October 2024
- b) amending the adoption date on the header for the Local Plan section from 2019 to 2024.
- c) changing the plan title to Dover District Local Plan to 2040
- d) removing the word 'draft' from the final sentence in the Local Plan supporting text
- e) adding a reference in the Kent Design Guide (section 4) which updates Kent County Council Parking Standards (January 2025)

2. Langdon Design Guidance and Codes Section 2.1 - Surrounding Context

We recommend updating the reference on page 12 from the Kent Downs AONB to the 'Kent Downs National Landscape'.

3. Langdon Design Guidance and Codes Section 2.3 - Heritage

A brief outline of the history of the principal settlements could be a beneficial introduction.

We recommend amending the following terms on page 15:

- Scheduled Ancient Monuments- delete the word 'ancient' as term has been changed
- replace 'Kent County Council Heritage maps' with 'Kent Historic Environment Record'

It is not clear how the timeline in para 2.3.1 demonstrates the historic development and evolution of the area or why the chosen events are important. A brief introduction of the history as suggested above may be a more logical format. It is also not clear whether the ward has always been the current boundary (this is unlikely) and concentrating on how each settlement has developed is suggested as a more appropriate way to showcase the history.

4. Section 03 – Character Study

The methodology for choosing the buildings that provide the evidence base for the character study has not been provided. It is unclear what buildings were chosen and why.

The character maps are very small, so it is difficult to see where the boundaries lie. A larger map would enable details/features such as routeways and key buildings/structures to be shown. Clearer/larger scale maps would also help to show the grain of the settlement which could help to inform appropriate layouts of new development, etc. We would also recommend that the conservation area boundary is shown on the relevant character areas maps.

5. CA2- Martin Character area

There is no reference to the conservation area in the text, which we consider an omission.

6. CA5- Countryside Character Area

No reference to historic farmsteads and their character, for example is there a prevailing layout (isolated, courtyard, etc.? recommend consulting the relevant theme paper in the Heritage Strategy for information) and what types of buildings are found (oasts, stables, barns, etc?). Farmsteads are significant contributors to the character of a rural area, so it is key to include them in any discussion of built form.

7. Section 4.1.1

We recommend updating the NPPF reference from paragraph 126 to paragraph 131 to reflect the December 2024 version.

8. SP. Safe Streets and Parking SP05 – Car Parking Solutions p45.

We recommend that code in the plan considers new parking guidance and standards recently adopted by KCC (February 2025) Kent County Council's Parking Standards, which would be used to implement Local Plan Policy TI3.

9. BF02

We recommend adding additional detail regarding garden sizes in the different character areas and removing the minimum general standard of 50sqm as this size of garden would not be characteristic for all areas.

10. BF04

We would advise that the code considers whether there could be circumstances where a flat roof may be appropriate, for example to reduce the scale of a building, protect a view or create a green roof, or where this design approach would protect or minimise harm to the significance of a heritage asset.

11. BF04

We recommend that the code considers how requirement BF 04 adds value to paragraph 4.15 of the Local Plan (LVIA required for landscape buffers as part of planning applications), Local Plan Policy PM1 Criterion 1a) (impacts on views) and SAP 46 criterion a) (mitigating impact of development in East Langdon on wider countryside) and whether an LVIA should be required or is necessary for all forms of development, including extensions as this is not considered proportionate information for a householder application.

12. BF05 Respect important views

We recommend replacing the word 'preserve' with 'avoid or minimise harm where setting contributes to the significance of a heritage asset' in the third bullet point to ensure compliance with NPPF. The term 'preserve' suggests any change is unacceptable.

13. BF06 Extensions and conversions

The 1st bullet-point concerning permitted development rights in conservation areas is incorrect; only some rights are removed in respect of extensions, not all, and neither conservation area has an Article 4 Direction imposed.

The NP may want to reference that listed buildings require particularly sensitive treatment to ensure the significance is protected/harm avoided or minimised.

Several of the bullet points seem to reference the conversion of historic agricultural buildings. Recommend the text in bullet point 9 is amended to read 'conversions of historic agricultural building should respect the characteristics and features that contribute to its heritage interest'.

It is unclear what 'like-for-like' materials mean in the context given in the final bullet point: is this suggesting reclaimed materials? It is assumed that this point relates to conversion of agricultural buildings, but the use of the word 'reuse' causes confusion. It should possibly be replaced with 'retention', i.e. retention of as much of the historic building fabric as possible.

14. BF07 Infill and backland

It is assumed that the second bullet point relates to above ground heritage rather than below ground heritage but this could be made clearer. The NP may also want to include 'but not confined to' before the list of items that need to be considered (this enables considerations such as form, building height, position on plot, etc. to be included)

15. BF08 Architecture details, materials and colour palette

Text does not include clear reference to prevailing colour palette. May be sufficient to simply note materials.

Referring to the Conservation Areas as the most historic parts of the parish is incorrect. Langdon Abbey for example was founded in 1192 and is consequently one of the earliest surviving buildings in the parish, but it is not in a Conservation Area.

The text on decentralised energy systems may be best placed elsewhere as unclear on its relevance in this section.

The need to 'preserve and enhance' when considering the conversion of historic (agricultural?) buildings to residential is not consistent with NPPF/legislation. It should be amended to Conserve or enhance.

16. EE Environmental and energy efficiency

Recommend a caveat regarding listed buildings and the need to ensure harm to significance is avoided or minimised. Recommend refer to the whole house approach advocated in the supporting text to policy HE1.

17 4.2 Application of design code BF04

it is not clear on why Marston Hall has been specifically identified within the text. Additionally, the reference to 'presence' should be reconsidered as the test is whether development harms the significance of a heritage asset including where setting contributes to that significance.

18. Drafting error- all character areas refer to BF09 but this does not appear to have been included in the document