

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

Index

| | Page number |
|---|-------------|
| WR001. Environment Agency | 2 to 8 |
| WR002. Nick Cramer | 9 to 23 |
| WR003. Paul Ferguson | 24 to 84 |
| WR004. Natural England | 85 to 87 |
| WR005. Historic England..... | 88 to 91 |
| WR006. National Highways..... | 92 to 94 |
| WR007. Kent County Council | 95 to 108 |
| WR008. Canterbury City Council | 109 to 113 |
| WR009. Environment Agency | 114 to 120 |
| WR010. Mike Goddard..... | 121 to 141 |
| WR011. Paul Ferguson | 142 to 145 |
| WR012. Geoffrey Crothall | 146 to 166 |
| WR013. Nick Cramer | 167 to 189 |
| WR014. Maria Shrimpton | 190 to 210 |
| WR015. William Hughes..... | 211 to 231 |
| WR016. Catherine Adamson | 232 to 252 |
| WR017. Neil Kirk | 253 to 273 |
| WR018. Philip Wicker..... | 274 to 294 |
| WR019. Rosa Lehmann | 295 to 315 |
| WR020. John Corfield..... | 316 to 336 |
| WR021. David Spencer | 337 to 357 |
| WR022. M Burns-Stark..... | 358 to 378 |
| WR023. Nicole Reader | 379 to 399 |
| WR024. Mark Esdale | 400 to 420 |
| WR025. Jane Martin..... | 421 to 441 |
| WR026. David Martin..... | 442 to 462 |
| WR027. Bridge Allotment Association | 463 to 483 |
| WR028. John Hill | 484 to 504 |
| WR029. A Walder..... | 505 to 525 |
| WR030. Kathryn Walder | 526 to 546 |
| WR031. Martin Vye..... | 547 to 567 |
| WR032. Darryn Probert..... | 568 to 588 |
| WR033. Joan Hill | 589 to 609 |
| WR034. Andrea Neame..... | 610 to 630 |
| WR035. Stuart Garnett..... | 631 to 651 |
| WR036. Christine Collins | 652 to 672 |
| WR037. Alan Atkinson..... | 673 to 693 |
| WR038. C Wortham | 694 to 714 |
| WR039. Carl Gower..... | 715 to 735 |



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

KSLPlanning [REDACTED]

25 May 2023 at 15:29

To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Dear Team,

We always recommend an objective is included to protect and enhance the environment. Indicators should relate to the environmental constraints in your local area. This may include flood risk, water quality, biodiversity.

Together with Natural England, English Heritage and the 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. (copy attached). There is a useful check list in this document.

We also recommend your plan takes account of relevant Thanet District Council policies, plans and strategies including TDC's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, flood risk strategies (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies>), and the South East River Basin Management Plan (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan>).

We hope this information is useful. Please don't hesitate to contact us if you need any further information.


Yours sincerely,

-Adam

Adam Blake

Planning Advisor, Sustainable Places, Kent, South London and East Sussex

Environment Agency | Orchard House, Endeavour Park, Addington, West Malling, Kent, ME19 5SH



Does Your Proposal Have Environmental Issues or Opportunities? **Speak To Us Early!**

If you're planning a new development, we want to work with you to make the process as smooth as possible. We offer a bespoke advice service where you will be assigned a project manager who be a single point of contact for you at the EA. This early engagement can significantly reduce uncertainty and delays to your project. More information can be found on our website [here](#).

Please note – Our hourly charge is now £100 per hour plus VAT from 1st April 2018.

From: [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** CCC Consultations
Sent: 12 May 2023 10:53
Subject: Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

You don't often get email from consultations@canterbury.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

[Quoted text hidden]

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.



Neighbourhood Plan Standard Response Jan 2021.docx
364K

Kent, South London and East Sussex Neighbourhood Plan Advice Note

Last updated: January 2021

Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to deliver multi-functional benefits through linking development with enhancements to the environment. This document sets out the key environmental issues which should be considered within our remit. Due to the high volume of work we are unable to provide detailed comments on Neighbourhood Plans at the present time.

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>

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 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies>), and the South East River Basin Management Plan (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan/>) Thames River Basin Management Plan (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289937/geth0910bswa-e-e.pdf) as appropriate.

The information below explains the key issues we would consider in reviewing your Plan. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment.

Flood risk

Development must be safe and should not increase the risk of flooding.

Neighbourhood Plans should conform to national and local policies on flood risk:

If a Neighbourhood Plan is proposing sites for development please check whether there are any areas of Flood Zones 2 or 3 within the proposed site allocations.

You can view a site's flood zone on the Flood Map for Planning on our website: <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

If the proposed allocation is located within Flood Zone 2 or 3 you should consult the Flood Risk and Coastal Change pages of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG): <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/>

Here you can determine whether the flood risk vulnerability of the proposed development and the flood zone are compatible. In accordance with national planning policy the Sequential Test should be undertaken to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. This should be informed by the Environment Agency's floodmap for planning and the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), if they have one. We recommend you contact the Local Planning Authority to discuss this requirement further.

We would have concerns if development is allocated in this high risk flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.

It is important that your Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with these sites can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward.

We can provide any flooding information which we have available – such as predicted flood levels and historical flood data. Please note that there may be a charge for this information. Please contact our Customers and Engagement Team at ksle@environment-agency.gov.uk for further details.

In addition to the above you should also check with the Local Planning Authority's Neighbourhood Planning team with regards to other sources of flooding (such as surface water, groundwater, sewers and historic flooding) as detailed in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), now has responsibility for local flood risk management and may hold flooding information that is not identified on our Flood Map.

Climate Change Allowances

The Local Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should indicate the extent of flood zones with likely climate change.

On 19 February 2016, we published new guidance for planners and developers on how to use climate change allowances: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>.

Flood Defences

Areas of your Neighbourhood Plan area, or proposed sites, may be given protection by a flood defence/alleviation scheme. Where this is the case the Plan should acknowledge this and identify the level of protection provided (including any climate change allowance). It should be noted that flood defences are intended to protect existing properties and are not to facilitate new development in areas that would otherwise be impacted by flooding. Any assessment of development behind flood defences should consider the impacts of a breach or overtopping. Where it is determined that new development should be behind a flood defence financial contributions may be sought to maintain or improve the structure.

Thames Estuary 2100 (Tidal Defences)

In line with requirements set out in the Thames Estuary 2100 ([TE2100](#)) plan, developments in this location will need to demonstrate how the flood defence could be raised in the future to meet the demands of climate change.

No activities on site should preclude access to the flood defence from maintenance or prevent the future raising of flood defences. In some cases we hold technical drawings of flood defence structures which may be of use. To request these you should contact our Customers and Engagement Team at ksle@environment-agency.gov.uk

Ecology

Proximity to watercourse/ Ecology

Main rivers can be viewed on the Environment Agency's map:

<https://environment.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=17cd53dfc524433980cc333726a56386>

We normally require a buffer zone of 8 metres (fluvial) and 16 metres (tidal) between any new development and the top of the bank of the main river. The permanent retention of a continuous unobstructed area is an essential requirement for emergency access to the river for repairs to the bank and for future maintenance and/or improvement works. A buffer between new development and the river wall is also required to ensure no adverse loading which could impact the stability of the channel wall. This buffer zone will help provide more space for flood waters, provide improved habitat for local biodiversity and allows access for any maintenance requirements.

Where development is proposed next to the river we recommend that it includes a green buffer strip alongside the watercourse. Where such a buffer strip does not currently exist, we normally seek that it is established. This is a key way in which we carry out our legal duty to further and promote the ecological and landscape value of rivers and land associated with them. In urban areas, in particular, rivers have often been degraded by past development, and we expect that any new development should go some way to redress the balance.

The provision of green infrastructure, particularly along rivers, and the inclusion of sustainable drainage techniques can help reduce the risk of flooding. This can also provide recreational and wildlife benefits. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in the Plan will be encouraged. In accordance with national policy, any development proposal should avoid significant harm to biodiversity and seek to protect and enhance it; delivering biodiversity net gain. We would not support development proposals if there was shown to be a likely detrimental impact on the water environment.

Water Management and Groundwater Protection

Local level actions and decision making can help secure improvements to the water environment. This is widely known as the catchment-based approach and has been adopted to deliver requirements under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). It seeks to:

- deliver positive and sustained outcomes for the water environment by promoting a better understanding of the environment at a local level; and
- encourage local collaboration and more transparent decision-making when both planning and delivering activities to improve the water environment.

Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to deliver multi-functional benefits through linking development with enhancements to the water environment. Local WFD catchment data can be obtained from: <http://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/>

Overall deterioration in water quality and promoting improvement in the ecological status of any water body. Actions to achieve this are listed in the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) and the South East River Basin Management Plan <https://www.gov.uk/search?q=River+Basin+Management+Plans>

Where appropriate, a WFD Assessment (<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/water-supply-wastewater-and-water-quality/water-supply-wastewater-and-water-quality-considerations-for-planning-applications/>) should assess any potential impacts on the watercourse and demonstrate that the required enhancements will be delivered. Any development that has the potential to cause deterioration in classification under WFD or that precludes the recommended actions from being delivered in the future is likely to be considered unacceptable to us.

Groundwater Quality

Development must not cause pollution to the water environment.

Aquifers and Source Protection Zones

Some of your local area, and specific potential site allocations, may be located upon or within aquifers and Source Protection Zones (link below). SPZ 1 is especially sensitive. You might consider these within your Plan and when allocating sites. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be seen with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

To see if a proposed development is located within a Source Protection Zone, please use our online map: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/groundwater-source-protection-zones-spzs>

Land Contamination

You must consider land contamination when preparing your plan. Managing it during development is key to addressing past contamination and preventing further impacts during development.

You can establish if a site may be contaminated in several ways. Your Local Authority may hold a register of sites it knows to be contaminated. A list of potentially contaminated sites can be accessed on the following link:

<https://www.claire.co.uk/useful-government-legislation-and-guidance-by-country/76-key-documents/198-doe-industry-profiles>

We recommend you contact your Local Authority's Environmental Health team who may hold records on known/potential land contamination. Please note our primary concern is with regards to water quality. Your Local Authority's Environmental Health team will advise you on issues related to human health.

Further information can be accessed on the following links:

Guiding principles for the Land Contamination

<https://www.claire.co.uk/useful-government-legislation-and-guidance-by-country/192-guiding-principles-for-land-contamination-gplc>

Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328160926/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/scho0804bibr-e-e.pdf>

Approach to Groundwater Protection:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/692989/Environment-Agency-approach-to-groundwater-protection.pdf

Water supply and foul drainage

When allocating sites in you Plan, you will need to consider if the water supply and foul drainage infrastructure can accommodate the development. Your local water company can provide further information about water supply and sewerage capacity.

Surface water drainage

The inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) should always be a consideration within any development to reduce the risk of surface water flooding on and off site. The Lead Local Flood Authority, is the main contact for SUDS issues. However, we have interest in SUDS from a groundwater protection perspective and those area of critical drainage.

The collection and dispersal of clean surface water to ground to recharge aquifer units and prevent localised drainage or surface systems flooding in heavy rainfall is encouraged. However, dispersal into the ground through soakaways or other infiltration systems requires a site-specific investigation and risk assessment. Generally, we would accept roof drainage going to soakaway (or other systems), but other surface drainage may need to go through treatment systems or to foul main, for instance vehicle parking. Infiltrating water has the potential to cause mobilisation of contaminants present in shallow soil/made ground which could ultimately cause pollution of underlying groundwater resources. Where contamination is known or suspected, remedial or other mitigating measures will likely be required so that it can be demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to Controlled Waters.

We advise applicants to follow our guidance – Groundwater Protection. This is a report that highlights the importance of groundwater and encourages industry and other organisations to act responsibly and improve their practices. This can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

The design of the drainage systems should be in line with G1, G9, G12 and G13 position statements: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>

Infrastructure Delivery

We would recommend that environmental infrastructure, including habitat enhancements, water storage areas, and green space, is taken into account if the Plan looks to fund local infrastructure.

Environmental Permitting Regulations

To see if a proposed development requires an Environmental Permit under the Environment Permitting Regulations please refer to our website:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/check-if-you-need-an-environmental-permit>

Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, a flood risk activity permit (FRAP) may be required for work:

- in, over or under a main river;
- within 8m of the bank of a main river, or 16m if it is a tidal main river;
- within 8m of any flood defence structure or culvert on a main river, or 16m on a tidal main river.

Flood risk activities can be classified as: exclusions, exemptions, standard rules or bespoke. These are associated with the level of risk the proposed works may pose to people, property and the environment. Local Authorities should advise developers to refer to the [flood risk activity permit section](#) of gov.uk for further information.

Please note

This document is a response to a Neighbourhood Plan consultation and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning application made in relation to any site.

You should seek your own expert advice in relation to technical matters relevant to any planning application before submission.

If you have any questions please contact the Kent and South London Sustainable Places team:

kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk



Victoria Asimaki [REDACTED]

Fwd: Inputs to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Review

CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

30 May 2023 at 09:40

To: Victoria Asimaki [REDACTED]

Regards,

Amy
Planning Team
Canterbury City Council
[REDACTED]

Please reply to planning@canterbury.gov.uk for your email to be acknowledged.Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Cramer** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, 29 May 2023 at 10:31

Subject: Inputs to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Review

To: CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>


Hi,

I attach a document of my input to the Reg 16 review of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan that I could not append to the Questionnaire due to the nature of the annexes depicting key villages communications at Reg 14.

I believe this is key information that will inform the review and request that this document be added to my input to the online questionnaire that I submitted 29/05/2023 am.

As a further input it was surprising that the only communication in Bridge village was on the facebook page that few of the villagers access. The Parish Council have not amplified the CCC communication on the Parish Council Board or in any other way, which may be detrimental to a full and open review considering the end date.

Best regards
Nick Cramer

**Nick Cramer Input To Reg 16 Review Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 26 05 2023 FINAL v8.docx**

39K

Comments on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan by Nick Cramer (resident of Bridge CT4 5BL) 26/05/2023

Aligns with comments on the questionnaire submitted am 29/05/2023, but contains key Annexes that could not be put into comments boxes on the Questionnaire.

Review of the Basic Conditions and Evidence

Summary:

It is my view that the neighbourhood plan does not meet the basic conditions and therefore should not proceed to the next stage.

The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

Basic Condition: Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State

It is my contention that this Neighbourhood Plan does not meet this basic condition regarding national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

It is clear that the independent examiner and local planning authority must reach a view in cases where different parts of national policy need to be balanced.

It is this balance that I wish to address here. Recognising there are no targets in the Canterbury District Development Plan 2017 for house building in the village of Bridge. In the case of this NP one of the primary objectives is to support the landowner in the building of 47 houses on land that is designated as AONB, Bifrons Conservation Area, Grade 1 agricultural land, an Asset of Community Value (ACVFN31) and has been defined as Local Green Space designation in the draft CDLP 2045 (SLAA271). The NP building proposal in the call for sites for this area was rejected by Canterbury City Planning as 'not suitable' (SLAA217).

Canterbury City Council reviewed this area of land after the A2 was completed and in a Canterbury City Council planning meeting of 31st Jan 1995 case summary DCA2354, it was concluded that the land remained an important part of the AONB and Bifrons Park Conservation Areas. See link to meeting documents;

<http://documents.canterbury.gov.uk/publisher/mvc/listDocuments?identifier=Conservation&idno=DCA2354>

The objective of the housebuilding is simply to obtain a contribution of funding for the building of a village hall and car parking and obtain the recreation ground land freehold. As shown in the NP the

house building is not seen as providing a positive contribution to the village itself, despite attempts at justifying targets for housing in the village.

The benefits of the 47 houses for the village is minimal as they are likely to be purchased by those outside of the village, not assisting with organic growth as implied in the NP. With the Mountfield development of 4000 houses within a few minutes, the vitality of the village and businesses will be maintained.

There is little support in the village for the additional 47 houses once the following biases have been removed:

- The implied threat of the loss of the recreation ground at lease expiry
- The cost of the recreation ground lease
- Delivery of suitable affordable housing as specified in the 2017 Housing Needs Survey
- Promises from the landowner and Local Authority that they will not target or propose any future development in the life of the plan.
- The funding proposed from the landowner for the village hall and car park initially £700K

Taking each in turn;

- The implied threat no longer exists since expert legal advice in Nov 2021 has confirmed the leaseholders right that lease can be extended on an equitable basis at a normal Agricultural level of rent
- The cost of the recreation ground lease is minimal (£500 pa)
- The affordable housing proposed in the building scheme does not comply with the requirements set by the village, that they can be allocated by the village for those in the village. These houses will be allocated through Canterbury City Council based on their priorities.
- No promises or assurances have been obtained in writing from the landowner or local authority and nothing is contained in the NP relating to these assurances.
- The funding proposed by the landowner and developer has been significantly reduced and is stated on the proposal as a 'minimum of £200K'

The village requirement for a new replacement village hall and car parking have not been fully reviewed and assessed. Nor are the alternative funding options via funding assistance or fundraising reviewed in the NP, without having to commit to building 47 houses to fund it. The alternatives have not been explored for developing affordable homes on available rural exception housing sites in the village, for allocation by the village for those in the village or with village connections.

To drive these objectives, the NP team have created bias by communicating to each house in the village that there is a threat of the loss of the recreation ground if they do not support the housebuilding requirements (See Appendix1) and also that the current proposed development of affordable housing is to be allocated by the village for village use (See Appendix 2).

Neither of these statements are now true and the Parish Council / NP Team are still relying on a historical village vote on this basis to promote the Neighbourhood Plan. The NP team have not communicated the true situation to the village on these points, or the statutory or other consultees, despite much prompting, and the documents contained in this Neighbourhood Plan continue to bias opinion and outcomes.

This is clearly against the CDLP 2017 policy on Neighbourhood Plan that the local community should be fully informed so they can participate, question, and inform the Neighbourhood Plan and deny them their rights.

- The premise of neighbourhood planning is that it is community-led, with the community establishing local (non-strategic) planning policies for development and use of land within its neighbourhood. Neighbourhood Development Plans enable local people to play a leading role in responding to the needs and priorities of the local community.

The balance is whether the permanent environmental and landscape damage caused by this development compares favourably with an uncertain requirement for a village hall and car park partially funded by the developer and landowner. My contention is that based on the National and CDLP policies on environmental protection and the clear responsibility of the Local Authority to plan for required housing, it is completely unnecessary to proceed with the development proposed in the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan.

There are no targets for housing in the Parish area and clearly this is not an 'exceptional circumstance' and cannot justify the building of 47 houses on this protected land. Further the Court of Appeal (<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2017/2102.html>) has determined that community benefits are not material planning considerations. 'The Cantley Proposals' are not integral to the proposed development and are not accordingly material in a planning sense. As stated by Bridge Parish Council's planning consultant upon 'soft examination' of the plan (January 2017):

"The justification [for site allocations] should be on planning grounds based on the evidence, not on the basis of popularity, unsupported assumptions or non-planning matters such as lease arrangements".

Basic Condition: Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area.

I believe that the Neighbourhood Plan fails this basic condition. It does not provide sufficient evidence of the exceptional benefits of this development that overcome the need 'to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area.' Or that 'the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).'

The area proposed for building of 47 houses, a major development, is clearly protected by AONB, the Bifrons Conservation Area, Grade 1 agricultural land, Asset of Community Value (ACVFN31) and has been defined as Local Green Space designation in the draft CDLP 2045 (SLAA271). The NP building proposal in the call for sites for this area was rejected as 'not suitable' (SLAA217).

The Local Green Space definition brings the protection under Canterbury District Local Plan July 2017 policy OS1 and OS9. It is recognised that although the CDLP 2045 is still in draft, this does demonstrate the clear direction of travel of Canterbury City Council Planning over the future use of this land, which I believe is a material consideration within this review.

It is clear under Local Plan OS1 that the building proposal within the NP does not demonstrate 'very special circumstances' and it clearly does 'material harm to the contribution the protected open space makes to the visual or recreational amenity of the area'.

Policy LB1 states 'Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty High priority will be given to conservation and enhancement of natural beauty in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and planning decisions should have regard to its setting. Major developments and proposals which conflict with the objective to conserve and enhance the AONB, or that endanger tranquillity, ***will not be permitted except in exceptional circumstances where it is demonstrated to be in the public interest***, the need is shown and any detrimental effect is moderated or mitigated...'

It is clear that there is no evidence in the NP to demonstrate that the building plan could be classified as an 'exceptional circumstance' nor can it be classified on balance as being 'in the public interest' once bias is removed.

The objective of the NP to achieve funding for a village hall and car park through supporting major development is an unacceptable compromise for the village and the environment and must be weighed against the policies in the National Policy Planning Framework.

- '176. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.' and
- '177. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.'
- '188. The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes)....'

In weighing up these proposals against the stated benefits and the assessment of basic conditions it is useful to note;

The Court of Appeal (<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2017/2102.html>) has determined that community benefits are not material planning considerations.

'The Cantley Proposals' are not integral to the proposed development and are not accordingly material in a planning sense. As stated by Bridge Parish Council's planning consultant upon 'soft examination' of the plan (January 2017): "The justification [for site allocations] should be on planning grounds based on the evidence, not on the basis of popularity, unsupported assumptions or non-planning matters such as lease arrangements".

Basic Condition: Prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan)

Regulation 14; Consulting on, and publicising, a neighbourhood plan or Order.

Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 41-047-20140306

A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan or Order and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan or Order
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan or Order

The Parish Council NP team have not been 'inclusive and open' in their preparation of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. The wider community has not been kept fully informed of what is being proposed which has prevented the wider community from conducting effective review and making their views known.

The wider community has not had the opportunity to be actively involved in shaping the plan, with a Neighbourhood Planning group consisting of only a subset of the Parish Council. Any open meetings that were conducted, limited debate and stifled changes in review or direction or review could be very intimidating. Views that have been made in writing have seldom informed changes in direction and when copies of these inputs can be obtained, inputs are simply be marked simply as 'noted', which is demotivating and stifles input.

Three significant examples show that the process applied by the NP Team at Regulation 14 has mislead the village, biased their opinions and affected their ability to make a clear assessment of the neighbourhood plan and the motivations behind it;

- The publication of the survey document at Appendix 1 to all houses in Bridge and further communicated at meetings and briefings, that the village would lose the use of their recreation ground at the end of the lease in June 2023 if they did not agree with the house building requirements proposed. Legal advice was obtained by the Parish Council from a land lease solicitor in Nov 2021 that clearly stated this was in error and that there is legal recourse to drive lease extension at agricultural land rents (£500 pa). This was not minutes in the Parish or Neighbourhood Meetings and this significant change was not communicated back to the village. It has not been shown in the Timeline of Activities and Events appended to 1.10 in the Consultation Statement, in fact reading through each point for the lease legal advice it still implies quite the reverse of the legal advice.
- Creation of the impression in the NP that there is a target for housing that the village of Bridge must comply with or achieve, a number of different scenarios are attempted none of which have any validity, no clear communication that there actually is no target in the CDLP for Bridge.
- The publication of the document at Appendix 2 as an introduction to the Housing Needs Survey 2017 Appendix C to the NP, leaving people believing that the NP will provide affordable housing that will be allocated by Bridge village to those in the village or connected with the village. In the building scheme proposed in the NP the houses must be allocated by Canterbury City Council to their needs. This has not been communicated to the village, simply removed as a benefit to the landowner's proposal.

In the campaign leaflet reproduced at Appendix 1 which sets out an offer of community benefits contained in 'The Cantley Proposals' and the leaflet refers to the recreation ground, Bridge Parish Council did not have regard to the publicity code;

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/5670/1878324.pdf for local authorities, as mandated by section 4(1) of the Local Government 1986 Act. In breach of paragraph 6 of this code, it used public funds to mount a publicity campaign with the primary purpose to persuade the public to hold a particular view on a question of plan policy.

The statutory attachments from those consulted in the NP are not based the current plan and in some cases are updated versions, in many cases these documents are based on the previous parish boundary and are out of date.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consultation Appendix D Environmental Report

No consultation has been carried out with the statutory consultees; Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency or the public on the Strategic Environmental Assessment to enable consultees to offer views on any aspect of the SEA process which has been carried out to date. This fails the legislative requirements and the basic conditions against The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Section 13. There was no indication in these documents as to how consultation responses to the SEA would be considered and how feedback would be provided to consultees.

Consultation Statement:

The consultation statement submitted with the draft neighbourhood plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the plan proposals. Bridge Neighbourhood Plan fails to comply with the legal requirements set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ('the 2012 Regulations'). Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) explains, the qualifying body should be open and inclusive in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan and ensure that the wider community is kept fully informed of what is being proposed; is able to make their views known throughout the process; has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan and is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan. The consultation process and timeline included in the document does not sufficiently detail those consulted, explain how they were consulted, summarise the main issues and concerns raised, describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the neighbourhood plan.

In some cases, such as the obtaining of legal advice on the recreation ground lease and the result of legal advice, how that was communicated and acted upon. In this case the information presented is misleading comes to wrong conclusions, was not communicated back to those who raised the issue and with no further action taken which is not procedurally compliant with the legal requirements set out in the Regulations.

To BRIDGE RESIDENTS from Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee

Dear Bridge Resident,

On **Saturday November 25** you can **vote** in **the Village Hall from 10.00 am – 4.00 p.m.** on development proposals which have been sent in the post to all households in the village by Cantley Ltd. Your vote will help us to decide whether or not these proposals should form part of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. The voting paper will ask the following:

Do you agree that the development proposals by Cantley Ltd should be included in Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <i>Please put an X in one box below</i> |
| YES | |
| NO | |

**Only those whose names appear on the electoral roll will be eligible to vote.*

**HAVING LOOKED AT THE
AVAILABLE EVIDENCE,
BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL
RECOMMENDS VOTE
YES
TO THE CANTLEY PROPOSALS**

Turn over to find out why...

Bridge Parish Council has agreed the following statement regarding these proposals.

All voters should consider the following information before voting:

| | |
|----|--|
| 1. | If this proposal is turned down, Cantley is likely to withdraw the negotiated package of benefits, and the Village will lose the valuable opportunity to acquire the freehold of the Recreation Ground, the land being set aside for a future village hall and a new parking area which is to include staff parking and improved access/drop off to/from the school. It is possible that no lease for the allotments would be forthcoming. |
| 2. | If this proposal is not in the Neighbourhood Plan, Bridge will have a very weak case to fight any future planning proposals should Canterbury be required to build more homes in the District. |
| 3. | If the lease of the Recreation Ground is not renewed the village would lose a valuable community space with the Parish Council being required to pay for the restoration of the area to how it was in 1973: (i.e. removing the tennis courts, the children's play area and the sports pavilion, the football pitch, the benches). The future of the allotments would remain uncertain. This would involve an increase in the precept paid by villagers. * |
| 4. | If the proposal is accepted the Parish Council will receive a lease for the allotments. |

Explanatory notes

1. *In summary, the Cantley proposals include:*

- *The **transfer in perpetuity of the Recreation Ground freehold to the Parish Council** subject to receipt of residential planning permission.*
- *To provide **land for a village hall** and associated car park/ school drop off area.*
- *The relocation of the on-street parking outside the school with a **new staff car parking area** in the northern part of the Recreation Ground.*
- *The creation of suitable vehicular access from Patricxbourne Road, with potential for road improvements and a secondary access via School Lane (subject to right of access).*
- *To build approximately **40 new homes**, (of which up to 12 or 30% could be affordable) on land between the recreation ground and the A2.*

The proposals can be read in full (with a map)

at: http://www.bridgevillage.co.uk/pdf/Bridge_A%20Proposal%20for%20the%20Future%20Leaflet%20Oct%202017.pdf

2. *A Neighbourhood Plan sets out a vision for an area and planning policies for the use and development of land. It will form part of the statutory planning framework for the area, and the policies and proposals contained within it will be used in the determination of planning applications. It can shape and influence where that development will go and what it will look like. Once satisfied with the plan, the local council will organise a referendum. A majority of people voting must support the plan if it is to be adopted by the local planning authority.*

3. *Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Committee is advising the Parish Council on the wording of the Neighbourhood Plan for the village. The latest draft is in the Neighbourhood Plan section of the village website www.bridgevillage.org.uk Request a paper copy from the Parish Council Clerk at 47 High St, Bridge CT4 5JZ or by email: clerk@bridgevillage.org.uk*

**The recreation ground is leased by the Parish Council from Cantley estates. The current lease was signed in 1973 and runs out in June 2023. Clause 14 of the lease states the following: "At the end ...of the... (lease) the Council shall remove all or any buildings or structures erected on the premises and shall pull down and remove the same in a workmanlike manner so as not to cause any damage to the.. premises.. and forthwith after such removal restore the site so far as possible to its present condition and pay the Landlord proper and adequate compensation for any damage caused by or resulting from such removal"*

Appendix 2

BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL Housing Needs Survey

June 2017

Dear Householder,

As you may know, an advisory committee of Bridge Parish Council is developing a Neighbourhood Plan for the area served by Bridge Parish Council. A very important element of the plan will be the allocation (or otherwise) of future site(s) for housing development. The plan must be based on perceived needs, as expressed by the local community. The last such survey was conducted 12 years ago and the committee has decided that the information gathered then (which contributed to the development at Brickfield Close) needs to be updated.

Owing to the high cost of housing in this area, the Parish Council is considering whether there might be a need for additional affordable housing in Bridge Parish so that residents who cannot afford to buy or rent locally will not be forced to move away. This type of affordable housing is also known as local needs housing; they are homes that can be rented or part bought (shared ownership) from a Housing Association. The reason for providing local needs housing is to help local people of all ages who would like to stay or return to their parish and contribute to the village services that still exist. See Q24 for further information on shared ownership.

We also want to know if there are older people in the parish who would like to downsize/move to more suitable housing for their needs but stay in the village. This includes people who own their current property or rent privately or through Canterbury City Council or a housing association.

We are sending out this Housing Needs Survey to assess the demand and gauge the level of support a small scheme might have in our community. We are doing so with the approval of Canterbury City Council, whose housing officers have approved this questionnaire. Tessa O'Sullivan, the Rural Housing Enabler from Action with Communities in Rural Kent is assisting us to carry out this survey. The survey will be analysed by the Rural Housing Enabler, with all information given being kept confidential. She will then give a summary report to the Parish Council.

Depending on the outcome of this survey, we may try to find a suitable site within the parish of Bridge.

The most likely type of site would be what is known as a 'Rural Exception Site', within or on the edge of the village whereby:

- All homes on the site are owned by a Housing Association
- Houses are either rented or part-sold (shared ownership) to tenants
- Only households with a genuine local connection are eligible to be tenants/part owners

Once a site is found a village consultation event will be held so that residents of the parish can view and discuss the proposals and put their views forward.

This is a very important issue, so please take time to fill in this survey. We want to know your views.

Please return this form using the FREEPOST envelope provided by 14th July 2017.

If any further information or additional questionnaires are required please contact the Rural Housing Enabler on [REDACTED] or email [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

Alan Atkinson, Chairman Bridge Parish Council



Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Fwd: Inputs to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Review

Planning CCC <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

18 July 2023 at 11:10

To: Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

One for you, thanks
Regards,
Lisa
Planning Team
Canterbury City Council
[REDACTED]



Please reply to planning@canterbury.gov.uk for your email to be acknowledged.
Please give us your views through our [customer satisfaction survey](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Cramer** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 17 Jul 2023 at 16:41
Subject: Fwd: Inputs to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Review
To: CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>

Hi,

I have forwarded again my input to the Reg 16 review of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan I submitted submitted on May 29th attachment 1 (**unchanged**).

To add to the original input, I attach additional comments, attachment 2, that have come to light in the intervening period. Please append this to my input of 29th May.

Best regards
Nick Cramer
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Cramer** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, May 29, 2023 at 10:31 AM
Subject: Inputs to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Review
To: CCC Planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>


Hi,

I attach a document of my input to the Reg 16 review of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan that I could not append to the Questionnaire due to the nature of the annexes depicting key villages communications at Reg 14.

I believe this is key information that will inform the review and request that this document be added to my input to the online questionnaire that I submitted 29/05/2023 am.

As a further input it was surprising that the only communication in Bridge village was on the facebook page that few of the villagers access. The Parish Council have not amplified the CCC communication on the Parish Council Board or in any other way, which may be detrimental to a full and open review considering the end date.

Best regards
Nick Cramer



2 attachments

Nick Cramer Input To Reg 16 Review Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 26 05 2023 FINAL v8.docx
39K



Additional Comments to be sent to CCC for NC v2.docx
18K

Additional comments (Dated 17/07/2023 16:18) on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 review, to be added to input previously made on 29th May 2023 by email.

Nick Cramer, [REDACTED] Dated 17/07/2023 16:18

A) Current Recreation Ground, Importance to the Village:

Half of the current recreation ground is proposed for housebuilding in the Neighbourhood Plan but the whole current recreation ground area is shown in the current Parish Councils own website as designated green space to be 'protected from development because of their importance to the community'. This is misleading to the public at Reg 14 as the NP does not state that there is any change to the current protected area of the recreation ground and so the public are unable to correctly assess the implications on the loss of this important space. Read down in their website.

<https://www.bridgevillage.org.uk/about-bridge/attractions-facilities/>

B) Inadequate Public Communication and Consultation

Information that would significantly influence public opinion in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan has been obtained by the Parish Council but been withheld in order to drive the building of the 47 houses in the NP. The public still have the understanding promoted widely by the Parish Council, that we could lose our recreation ground if we do not commit to the housebuilding.

This means at Reg 14 the public have been unable to consult on these areas at Q&A sessions and meetings and provide their relevant feedback.

The changes to understanding of the recreation ground legal position were not publicly presented at any meetings or Q&A sessions, nor was this minuted in the minutes of the Neighbourhood Planning meetings nor in the Parish Council meetings, despite having been points of discussion at those meetings.

The NP Q&A meetings identified in the on the 1st and 2nd Dec 2021 in the 'Timeline' document (as referenced in the Consultation Document) did not present the changes to the legal position to those attending. The meetings were not minuted, which does not adhere to the requirement for proper consultation of the issues and concerns, nor does it identify openness in consultation. The findings that the 'majority or attendees gave positive feedback' is clearly just a 'perception', as no feedback survey was conducted.

The documentation provided at Reg 16 for examination does not correct these inaccuracies and so the public have been unable to comment on these issues to the examiner in relation to the building plans.

The public in the parish were not informed or consulted on these key changes in the legal position, that meant the parish was not under any threat of losing our recreation ground should we not agree to the building of 47 houses. This change is highly likely to change parishioners' views over the housebuilding contained in the NP.

From emails provided under and FOI request, it is clear the Parish Council was fully aware from 3rd Nov 2021 that there is a legal right to extend the recreation ground lease. Independently after much public pressure, on the 17th Nov 2021 the Parish Council obtained their own legal advice on the recreation ground lease, that confirmed the right to extend. This change in legal advice was not

published or minuted in any Parish Council meetings and had to be obtained by a freedom of information request from the Parish Council.

The email from Charlie Gooch (Landowner's agent), to the Bridge Parish Clerk dated 3rd Nov 2021 is shown below.

In this email their legal advisors confirm the Parish Council have a clear legal right to extend the lease.

-----**Extract from attachment, provided by the PC Clerk 'correspondence 01/11/21-31/01/22 FOI'--**

Message from Charlie Gooch to the Clerk 3rd November 2021

Dear Jenny,

Thank you for your email of 22nd of October. As a result I was asked to obtain advice from our own solicitors on the subject of the Recreation Ground Lease.

We have now heard back from them and have been advised that the Parish Council have an automatic right for a renewal of the lease.

If the Parish Council and Cantley Ltd were unable to agree terms for a new lease than the Parish Council can apply to the Court who will grant a new lease on similar terms save as to rent. The maximum period that the Court can grant is 15 years.

It is very much hoped that it would not come to this and that we would be able to agree terms for a new lease to commence in July 2023.

If the developments adjoining the Recreation Ground and Great Pett Farmyard were to go ahead then Cantley Ltd would not develop any other sites in the parish during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Kind regards,

Charlie

-----End of FOI extract-----

Communications Bias during Reg 16 review:

<https://www.communityad.co.uk/back-issues/bridge-villages-community-ad-magazine-issue-32/>

Unwittingly the Community Ad magazine article at Issue 32, July 2023, page 20, under the article 'Bridge Neighbourhood Plan' has publicly amplified and clarified the biases that are intended to drive the building of the 47 houses contained within the Neighbourhood Plan. I confirmed with the editors of the magazine that this was simply a summary of what a causal reader would understand from the NP.

Despite the positivity in the article the NP itself makes no specific commitments for the Parish Council to achieve against any of the stated plans or policies, except that of the building of the 47 houses, Village Hall and Car Park. Also none of the other objectives, plans or policies provide more than is provided through National or CCC Local Plan legislation.

The article clearly shows that the NP achieves its objective of biasing opinion towards the building of the 47 houses, in fact the Community Ad reporter did not even pick up that main intention of the

plan was to lock the NP into legislation alongside the CCC Local Plan that would drive through the building plans, and that it would achieve little more than that.



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Draft Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 consultation

Paul Ferguson [REDACTED]

9 June 2023 at 21:40

To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

Dear Consultations,

Please find attached my reg 16 consultation response regarding the draft Bridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Please confirm receipt and that my response will be provided to the independent examiner.

Thank you.

Best regards,
Paul Ferguson



FergusonP Bridge NPlan Reg 16 Consultation Response.pdf
7388K

Paul Ferguson



9 June 2023

Dear Examiner,

Please find as follows my points on the draft Bridge Neighbourhood Plan regulation 16 consultation.

1. The Consultation Statement does not contain with any specificity the main issues and concerns raised, nor does it describe in any meaningful way how issues and concerns have been considered and addressed.
2. Bridge Parish Council has not complied with reg 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. As the responsible authority it has not consulted upon the SEA.
3. How, when and why were the SEA options arrived at?
4. The attached Examiner's Report on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033 is relevant.
5. The attached Examiner's correspondence is also relevant context [letters 9 Oct & 13 Nov 2018].
6. The HRA, para, 1.1 gives the plan timescale as 2018-2035. The draft Neighbourhood Plan's timescale's 2022-2037.
7. The SEA mentions 40 homes/dwellings; the draft Neighbourhood Plan refers to 47.
8. Para 4.17 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan references a risk of loss of recreational assets "at some point after the current lease with the private owner of the freehold of the recreation ground expires in 2023". The attached Parish Council minute 61/21-22 records: "Cantley have ... confirmed that if the lease expires without agreement then a new one off new lease would be granted for 15 years on similar terms except for the rent". There are also Landlord and Tenant Act renewal rights.
9. The recreation ground is a registered asset of community value with Localism Act 2011 section 95 disposal implications.
10. Para 4.20 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan cites "control over the village's recreational resources" as an "exceptional reason for the use of AONB land". The benefits of "control" cannot outweigh AONB harm.
11. Para 4.22 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan refers to the pre-A2 construction AONB designation. The attached planning committee minutes refer to the A2 and recognise the proposed policy C2 development site's "considerable landscape value with many fine trees and forms an important part of the setting of the villages of Bridge and Patricxbourne".

The draft Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the basic conditions.

Sincerely,

Paul Ferguson

Report on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2033

An Examination undertaken for Canterbury City Council with the support of the Bridge Parish Council on the June 2018 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Mary O'Rourke BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Date of Report: Fact Check Version 28 January 2019

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Main Findings - Executive Summary | 3 |
| 1. Introduction and Background | 4 |
| • Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033 | 4 |
| • The Independent Examiner | 4 |
| • The Scope of the Examination | 5 |
| • The Basic Conditions | 6 |
| 2. Approach to the Examination | 6 |
| • Planning Policy Context | 6 |
| • Submitted Documents | 7 |
| • Site Visit | 7 |
| • Written Representations with or without Public Hearing | 7 |
| 3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights | 8 |
| • Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation | 8 |
| - Consultation Statement | 8 |
| - Consultation Statement (as submitted) | 8 |
| - Response to my first procedural letter | 9 |
| - Response to my second procedural letter | 9 |
| - Consultation undertaken | 10 |
| - Conclusions on consultation | 12 |
| • Modifications | 13 |
| • Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area | 14 |
| • Plan Period | 14 |
| • Development and Use of Land | 14 |
| • Excluded Development | 15 |
| • Human Rights | 15 |
| 4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions | 15 |
| • General issues of compliance of the Plan | 15 |
| - Regard to national policy and advice | 15 |
| - Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development | 16 |
| - General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan | 17 |
| - EU Obligations | 18 |
| • Specific issues of compliance of the Plan's policies | 19 |
| - Introduction | 19 |
| - Planning policies | 21 |
| 5. Conclusions | 33 |
| 6. Formal Recommendation | 34 |
| Appendix: Non Statutory Modifications | 35 |

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/NP) and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I recommend that the Plan should not proceed to Referendum on the basis that it does not meet all the necessary legal requirements.

Whilst parts of the Plan comply with the statutory requirements, I have concluded that, within the remit of this examination:

- The Plan has not had regard to national policies and advice contained in the advice and guidance issued by the Secretary of State in respect of the consultation and engagement on the draft Plan, as required under the Basic Condition in paragraph 8(2)(a) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); and
- The consultation statement fails to meet the requirements of Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) in respect of the prescribed content of a consultation statement.

I have considered whether it would be appropriate to formally recommend the making of modifications that would secure compliance with the above requirements. However, I conclude in this report that the nature of these failings is such that these are not matters which are capable of being remedied at the examination stage and, therefore, this course would not be appropriate.

Notwithstanding these two key failures, I have assessed the Plan and its policies against the remaining legal requirements, including the Basic Conditions. I find a number of other matters in the Plan and its policies that do not meet the relevant legal requirements. However, these are matters which in my view were capable of being remedied, had the Plan been able to proceed beyond the two consultation related failings identified above.

In the interests of being helpful, I have indicated informally the recommended modifications I would have suggested to address these other matters in the Plan and its policies in order to meet the legal requirements. Whilst in this context my recommended modifications are not intended to attract any legal status, I hope they will inform and assist the Parish Council in reviewing the potential way forward.

1. Introduction and Background

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan June 2018

- 1.1 Bridge lies about 3km to the south east of Canterbury and to the south of the A2 London to Dover trunk road, which forms part of the north and eastern boundary of the parish. The parish comprises the village of Bridge, which straddles the former main road, and farmland to west and north. It is situated in the valley of the Nail Bourne, a groundwater fed ephemeral watercourse, the course of which runs through the village. The rural landscape is defined by the valley topography and the farmland and parkland of Bourne Park and Bifrons Park to the south and north, respectively, of the village are designated as Conservation Areas. The historic core of the village is also designated as a Conservation Area. That part of the parish lying to the south of Station Road and Town Hill lies within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In 2011 the Census showed a resident population of 1,576 people in the parish, of which more than half were of working age and 30% aged over 65 years, higher than the national average.
- 1.2 The decision to prepare a neighbourhood plan was taken by the Parish Council early in January 2012 and the formal application for designation as a neighbourhood plan area was approved by Canterbury City Council in July 2013. The first meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee was held in April 2012, initially comprising parish councillors but subsequently local groups were invited to send representatives to join the committee. In January 2017, the decision was taken to formally constitute the Committee as a sub-committee of the Parish Council, with membership determined by the Parish Councillors. The Strategic Environmental Assessment refers to this as the Neighbourhood Plan Group but for the sake of consistency, I have referred throughout this report to the plan-making body as the Neighbourhood Plan Committee. The Consultation Statement, required to be prepared in accord with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) is bound in at the back of the Plan and I consider it in more detail in section 3 below.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the NP has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the NP by Canterbury City Council, with the agreement of the Bridge Parish Council.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with some 40 years of experience in the public and private sector, most recently determining major planning appeals and examining development plans and national infrastructure projects. I have previous experience of examining neighbourhood plans. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
 - whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
 - Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ('the 2012 Regulations').
- 1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

- 1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
 - Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
 - Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.9 Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 to the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017¹.

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Canterbury City Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 24 July 2018, replacing the previous 2012 NPPF. The transitional arrangements for local plans and neighbourhood plans are set out in paragraph 214 of the 2018 NPPF, which provides '*The policies in the previous Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019*'. A footnote clarifies that for neighbourhood plans, '*submission*' in this context means where a qualifying body submits a plan to the local planning authority

¹ This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

(LPA) under Regulation 15 of the 2012 Regulations. The NP was submitted to Canterbury City Council in June 2018. Thus, it is the policies in the previous NPPF that are applied to this examination and all references in this report are to the March 2012 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft NP June 2018;
 - the map on page 4 of the NP, which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
 - the undated Consultation Statement, which is bound in at the back of the Plan;
 - the undated Basic Conditions Statement, which is bound in at the back of the Plan;
 - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), dated February 2018, included as Appendix B to the Plan and prepared by AECOM for the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee; and
 - The information received from the City Council and from the Parish Council in response to the questions in my procedural letters of 9 October 2018 and 13 November 2018².

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the area on 15 October 2018 to familiarise myself with it, and to visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the NP and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I have considered a request to hold a hearing, albeit there is no right to be heard, however I find hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan, and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a Referendum.
- 2.6 I also gave careful consideration as to whether to hold an exploratory meeting, following my written exchanges with the Parish and City

² View at:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1f5u6M8XGoDq6KHIFntfjoeZSgmVYdrac?ogsrc=32>

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Councils. For the reasons set out in section 3 below, I determined not to convene an exploratory meeting.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

The Consultation Statement

3.1 Neighbourhood planning is described at paragraph 183 of the NPPF as giving '*communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need*'. The PPG advises that a qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan and ensure that the wider community:

- Is kept fully informed of what is being proposed;
- Is able to make their views known throughout the process;
- Has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan; and
- Is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan³.

The Consultation Statement (as submitted)

3.2 The 2012 Regulations require that where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority it must include a consultation statement⁴. Regulation 15(2) defines a consultation statement as meaning a document which contains '*(a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan; (b) explains how they were consulted; (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan*'. Schedule 1 to the Regulations provides a list of consultation bodies and further advice is given in the PPG on the need to involve the wider community, other public bodies, landowners and the development industry in the Plan preparation⁵.

3.3 The Consultation Statement is included in the NP document at pages 32 to 38. It includes a list of those consulted and refers to exhibitions, interviews, questionnaires and voting having taken place. It includes a consultation timeline. However, there is scant information in the timeline on the form of any consultation, what it was and how it was done, for how

³ PPG Reference ID: 41-047-20140306.

⁴ Regulation 15(1)(b).

⁵ PPG Reference ID: 41-047-20140306 and 41-048-20140306.

long, any analysis of the responses to those consultations, and how those responses informed the NP Committee in terms of the identification of issues, the drafting of policies and the preparation of the NP. Moreover, the last entry on the timeline was 27 April 2017, some 14 months before the Regulation 15 submission. I raised these concerns in the questions annexed to my first procedural letter of 9 October 2018.

Response to my first procedural letter

- 3.4 In response to my initial procedural letter querying the adequacy of the Consultation Statement, the Parish Council brought the timeline up to date⁶. However, it still lacked the type and depth of detail that I would have expected to see in a Consultation Statement to be satisfied that the requirements of the Regulations had been met, and regard paid to the advice in the PPG. Whilst it now included a column to indicate where analysis is available, for example of the school fete exhibition held on 25 June 2013, there is nothing in the timeline to explain the result of that analysis, or indeed any summary of the main issues and concerns raised at that event.
- 3.5 For that analysis, the 23 October 2018 response from the Clerk to the Parish Council referred me to the Council's web page and the NP reports and papers, each of which has to be individually downloaded to be read. The requirement in the Regulations that a Consultation Statement is prepared and submitted, should mean that local people and those interested in how the results of consultation with the wider community has informed the drafting of the Plan do not have to undertake that form of '*fishing trip*'. It is important that the consultation process is transparent and open, and that it should be seen to be so.
- 3.6 In the Consultation Statement there is a list of 'main issues and concerns raised'. However, it is simply a list of 5 matters. There is no detail of what the issues raised actually were, for example, in relation to greenfield sites or local housing needs. Again, there is no evidence in the Statement or timeline of how those issues and concerns were considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan. For all these reasons, I was not satisfied that the submitted Consultation Statement had had due regard to the advice in the PPG nor that it was procedurally compliant with the legal requirements set out in the Regulations.

Response to my second procedural letter

- 3.7 In accord with the advice in the March 2018 'Guidance to service users and examiners'⁷, I drew the City and Parish Councils' attention to this

⁶ Bridge Parish Clerk's response of 23 October 2018.

⁷ Produced by representatives from the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS), the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), IPe, Locality, and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). View at:

<https://www.rics.org/globalassets/rics-website/media/upholding-professional->

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

potentially serious procedural shortcoming in my second procedural letter of 13 November 2018 as a matter which could lead to me being unable to recommend that the NP proceed to referendum. In response, the Parish Council forwarded me a set of documents entitled Bridge NP Consultation Statement November 2018, which sought to provide more detail to supplement the skeleton timeline that was provided with the NP, and which had subsequently been updated.

- 3.8 Disappointingly, the additional information provided still does not take the form of a Consultation Statement, of which there are many examples available from the more than 500 neighbourhood plans that have been made. What has been provided is a more detailed timeline with year files of supporting documents, including copies of questionnaires sent out, newsletters, analyses of the results of consultations, and extracts from the Parish Council Committee minutes. Although, not all the documents are dated and not all are complete, I have been able to compile the following summary.

Consultation undertaken

- 3.9 Following the application for the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area, a note attached to the Submission Plan explains that a neighbourhood planning committee was established early in 2012 as a separate and independent body answerable to the Parish Council and comprising Parish Councillors and volunteers representing various village organisations. Subsequently, I understand that that committee was appointed as a formal sub-committee of the Parish Council. Whilst representations have been made about the selection of those committee members, this is a matter for the Parish Council to address and does not go to the adequacy of the consultation carried out.
- 3.10 During the Plan preparation period evidence has been given of a range of methods that were used to engage with the community and local business, including questionnaires, letters to local businesses, attendance at public events, specific meetings, notes in the village newsletter, and the setting up of a neighbourhood plan website. Following the application for designation as a neighbourhood plan area early in 2012, a questionnaire was distributed to all the households in Bridge asking for residents' views on further housing in the village and on village facilities. The 335 questionnaires completed were used to identify key issues and priorities for the Plan to address, with the Parish Council concluding at that time that the case for large scale housing development in Bridge had not been proven. The results of the consultation were displayed at public events in August 2012 and in June 2013, the latter being attended by 102 residents when a further 42 questionnaires were returned. In addition, the committee had a stand at the June 2013 school fete to reach younger

people. Further evidence gathering included a survey in May 2014 asking residents and non-residents about parking in Bridge.

- 3.11 In October 2014, the first draft of the NP was produced for consultation and sent to all households⁸ and an exhibition was held in November 2014 at the Village Hall. Some 131 questionnaires were returned, although there was no formal response from the City Council, Kent County Council as Highways Authority or local businesses. In response to the comments made, it was proposed that members of the Committee would review the Plan's chapters.
- 3.12 Subsequently I understand from the documents provided to me as part of the November 2018 Consultation Statement that in 2015 the Parish Council initiated separate discussions with Cantley Ltd about the renewal of the recreation ground lease, due to expire in 2023. It appears that in response to those discussions, Cantley Ltd put forward proposals that included new housing development in Bridge. These were publicised in the Parish Council's autumn newsletter and two public meetings were held in October 2015, chaired by the Parish Council, and which together were attended by some 65 villagers with 71 emails and 15 letters received afterwards. Of those responses, the majority were noted as being against the proposals.
- 3.13 In March 2016, the NP Committee carried out an update and further consultation, asking for villagers' views on where housing developments (if any) should be proposed in the emerging NP. Displays at the 2 public consultation events indicated 6 potential sites, 5 put forward by local landowners and a City Council owned site, not previously considered in the 2014 draft Plan. A leaflet was distributed to all households in the parish asking for the 6 sites to be placed in order of preference. The 166 responses received were analysed by the Parish Council and the sites ranked, indicating a preference for development at Conyngham Lane and Brickfields. An information event was also held at the school fete in June 2016 where the timeline notes 56 people spoke to members of the Plan Committee or its planning consultant. Later in January 2017, 123 residents attended an exhibition and information event to discuss the inclusion of Local Green Spaces and valued views in the Plan and 224 responses were received to the June 2017 housing needs survey.
- 3.14 In November 2017 Cantley Ltd leafletted the villagers on its proposals '*to resolve the Recreation Ground lease renewal and potentially release some of its land for future development*'. The accompanying illustrative masterplan showed 40 houses with a new access to Patricxbourne Road and an extension of the road serving the primary school to access a potential new village hall. A vote on the proposals was held on 25 November 2017, with the NP Committee recommending in its own letter

⁸ See page 21 of Bridge Parish Council November 2018 Consultation Statement.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

circulated to all Bridge residents that the Cantley proposals were supported. Of the 328 votes cast, 215 were for the proposals (65%)⁹.

- 3.15 Consultation, in accordance with Regulation 14, took place between February and April 2018 and two public exhibitions were held on 18 March and 7 April. Fifty responses were received including detailed comments from the City Council, Environment Agency, Kent Downs AONB Unit, Natural England and Historic England. Revisions made to the draft Plan as a result of this consultation are documented in the Parish Council's November 2018 Consultation Statement¹⁰. However, there is no comprehensive analysis of those responses and many of the amendments and clarifications sought, for example by the City Council¹¹ and by the Environment Agency, do not appear to have been considered at all.
- 3.16 Subsequently the June 2018 Consultation Draft version of the NP was submitted to the City Council under Regulation 15. Consultation on the submitted Draft NP, in accordance with Regulation 16, was carried out for six weeks from 6 July to 7 September 2018. Thirty-three responses were made by interested parties including the City Council, both as local planning authority and land owner, statutory bodies, the Kent Downs AONB Unit, developers and local residents.

Conclusions on consultation

- 3.17 The legal requirement at Regulation 15(1) is clear that where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority, it must include (b) a consultation statement. Regulation 15(2) prescribes what is meant by a consultation statement. There is guidance from Planning Aid on the production of a consultation statement¹², and examples available from the large number of neighbourhood plans that have already been made. In my view, the Statement submitted with the Plan was inadequate. It failed to comply with the legal requirements both in respect of providing minimal information about the persons and bodies consulted and how they were consulted¹³, and in terms of summarising the main issues and concerns raised and how these were considered, and where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan¹⁴.
- 3.18 In response to my procedural letters, drawing attention to this problem, I was provided with further information and documents by the Parish Council. Although none delivered the clear and auditable narrative that I would expect to see to demonstrate compliance with the Regulations, my

⁹ Draft minutes of Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee 29 November 2017.

¹⁰ See the table at page 7, page 33 and pages 36-38 of the document.

¹¹ I give two examples out of many: that the Plan period should align with that of the Local Plan, and that policy A2 should include a definition of the built up area boundary.

¹² View 'Approaches to writing a consultation statement' at:

[https://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/Approaches to writing a consultation statement1.pdf](https://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/Approaches%20to%20writing%20a%20consultation%20statement1.pdf)

¹³ Regulation 15(2)(a) and (b).

¹⁴ Regulation 15(2)(c) and (d).

examination of the material did establish that over the 6-year gestation period of the Plan, the Parish Council had made efforts to engage with the wider community of Bridge. Events were held to inform residents of what was being proposed and to seek their views. Questionnaires were circulated, surveys held and the analyses of results used to inform the drafting of the Plan.

- 3.19 However, I found a lack of transparency, consistency and coherency in the documents provided to me as to the main issues and concerns raised by those consulted, and most importantly, how those issues and concerns had been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan. In the absence of a properly worked up Consultation Statement, I have to conclude that an inclusive and open consultation process, as advocated in the PPG, has not been shown to have been followed. I cannot be satisfied that the community was able to be directly involved in developing a shared vision for their neighbourhood, in accord with the NPPF.
- 3.20 **Taking everything into account, I conclude that the consultation process was not robust. It did not have regard to the NPPF and PPG, and consequently in this regard, the Plan does not meet the Basic Condition under paragraph 8(2)(a) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. This is accompanied by a failure to comply with Regulation 15(2) of the 2012 Regulations.**

Modifications

- 3.21 In coming to my conclusion on whether or not the NP should proceed to Referendum, I have given careful consideration as to whether it would be appropriate to recommend the making of modifications that would be able to secure that the above legal requirements were met. **For the reasons given in this report, I have concluded that there are no modifications I can recommend in these circumstances. The failure to have regard to the NPPF and PPG in the NP's consultation and engagement processes and the failure to comply with Regulation 15(2), concerning the statutory content of a consultation statement, is not in my view capable of remedy at this stage.** For the same reasons, I determined that the holding of an exploratory meeting could not serve to facilitate a way to overcome the nature of the shortcomings identified. In addition, my letter of 13 November 2018 forewarned the seriousness, in no uncertain terms, of my concerns in relation to the legal compliance of the Plan.
- 3.22 However, had I not been recommending that the NP failed to meet the legal requirements, I would have sought to make recommendations in relation to other matters, where necessary, to modify the NP in order that its policies and proposals meet the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For the benefit of the qualifying body and LPA, and as has become common practice in these circumstances, I have included in this

report what would have been my recommended modifications to the NP and its policies, had the failings of the NP been surmountable. For ease of reference, I have listed these recommended modifications (**RM**s) separately in the Appendix. They are made in the hope that they provide helpful feedback to the Parish Council; they are advisory and have no intended legal status in relation to paragraph 10(2)(b) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.23 The NP has been prepared and submitted for examination by Bridge Parish Council which is a qualifying body for an area designated by Canterbury City Council on 25 July 2013. In the interests of clarity, I would have recommended that paragraph 1.1 of the NP should confirm that the NP was prepared and submitted by the Parish Council and it would help to make clear those to whom '*our vision*' in paragraph 1.1 of the Plan is intended to refer (**RM1**).
- 3.24 It is the only neighbourhood plan for Bridge, and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.25 The date of the NP is given as June 2018, whilst paragraph 1.1 describes the NP as '*setting out our vision for the future of Bridge until 2033*'. I note that the plan period for the Canterbury District Local Plan is from 2011 to 2031, and I have considered the City Council's response to the Regulation 14 Consultation which explicitly advised that the NP should be aligned in terms of its end date with that of the adopted Local Plan. The PPG points to the desirability of agreeing the relationship of the policies in an emerging neighbourhood plan and the adopted development plan, and whilst it does not specifically refer to the need for alignment of the respective plan periods, I note that the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the NP was predicated on a plan period to 2031. The only reason offered by the Parish Council for the 2033 end date was that the Plan was intended to be in force for 15 years. Given the reasonable expectation that it would be reviewed before the plan period expired, I suggest that the NP period should be aligned with that of the adopted Local Plan and the period to which the NP is to take effect should be clearly set out on the front cover. I would have recommended modification **RM2** to secure this.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.26 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.27 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

Human Rights

- 3.28 In response to my question, the Parish Council has confirmed that the Plan has been drawn up having full regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998. Canterbury City Council has not alleged that the Plan breaches Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). I have considered this matter independently and I have found no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

- 4.1 Notwithstanding my findings in relation to the failures already outlined, I have approached the remaining assessment of compliance with the Basic Conditions of the NP as two main matters:

- General issues of compliance of the Plan as a whole; and
- Specific issues of compliance of the Plan's policies.

As set out in paragraph 3.22 above, I have sought to indicate where the Plan's policies either meet the Basic Conditions as drafted, or where I would have made recommended modifications to meet the Basic Conditions had I been able to remedy the consultation related failings of the Plan.

General Issues of Compliance of the Plan

Regard to national policy and advice

- 4.2 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities¹⁵. Further detailed advice is provided in the PPG on neighbourhood planning.
- 4.3 The NPPF is clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (paragraph 6) and there

¹⁵ NPPF Introduction paragraph 1.

should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14). Importantly, this means that neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development (paragraph 16). They should not promote less development than set out in the local plan or undermine its strategic policies (paragraph 184).

- 4.4 The Basic Conditions Statement describes the Plan's policies as having each been considered against the policies contained within the NPPF. However, there is nothing more in the Statement to indicate how this was done. This is a shortcoming of the Basic Conditions Statement but not one that I find fatal, although it should be addressed in any future iteration of the Plan **(RM3A)**.
- 4.5 The NP contains policies covering seven broad areas, which correspond with section headings in the NPPF; these being the economy and village centre, sustainable transport, housing choice and good design, a healthy community, climate change and flooding, natural environment, and historic environment. In these respects, the NP is aligned with national policy and guidance and, in terms of the Basic Condition, has had regard to current national policies and advice. However, there are a number of points in relation to detailed matters of due regard that I address in the Specific Issues section below.
- 4.6 There is also one particular area of concern that I have that is rooted in national planning policy. This relates to advice in the PPG that neighbourhood plan policies should be clear and unambiguous. They should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence which reflects and responds to the context and characteristics of the area¹⁶. In the Specific Issues section below, I have identified many examples where policies are poorly and ambiguously worded, lack justification and are unsupported by appropriate evidence of particular local circumstances. I have endeavoured, where appropriate, to suggest recommendations to assist in any future redrafting. But in certain instances, where the justification for and purpose of the policy is unclear, and given that I am not recommending that the NP proceed to Referendum, I indicate that the policy should be deleted. It will then be for the Parish Council to decide if it wishes to include a rewritten and justified policy in any future version of the NP.

Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development

- 4.7 The NP sets out a vision for Bridge till 2033; that it *'will continue as a sustainable, identifiable, village community that values its open space and separation from Canterbury. It will have developed local services and*

¹⁶ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

transport links that provide residents with a strong safe community identity. The historic fabric of the village will be conserved and enhanced'. This is consistent with the achievement of sustainable development.

- 4.8 Sustainable development is described in the NPPF as having three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. The Plan's seven objectives replicate headings in the NPPF of matters that go towards the delivery of sustainable development. I am satisfied that the Plan provides for the economic dimension to sustainable development through its promotion of new business floorspace, support for the village centre and for existing and new businesses. By proposing new housing, resisting the loss of community facilities, and encouraging development of a high quality of design, the NP supports a healthy local community in Bridge; the social dimension to sustainable development. In proposing policies to protect the village's open spaces and views, to minimise vulnerability to flooding, to retain the village's identity, it addresses the environmental dimension to sustainable development.
- 4.9 Subject to the detailed points set out in the Specific Issues section below and my suggested recommendations, I would have found that the NP has the potential to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

- 4.10 Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the extant Local Plan, which here is the recently adopted Canterbury District Local Plan 2017. Strategic policies include, but are not limited to, those delivering homes and jobs, providing retail, leisure and commercial development, providing infrastructure, addressing climate change, and conserving and enhancing the natural and built environment. Although the Basic Conditions Statement includes a schedule of the NP's policies cross-referenced to policies in the Local Plan, some of the references are incorrect and the Statement lacks any analysis of how the policies in the NP are in general conformity with and support the strategic policies. I suggest this should be addressed in any future version of the NP (**RM3B**).
- 4.11 Bridge is identified in the Local Plan's settlement hierarchy as one of the local centres where a higher level of development might be supported than in the smaller rural settlements. The Local Plan advises that development needs to be considered in the context of the size and character of the village and *'the scale, quality and location of appropriate development will be dependent on the individual characteristics of each*

*village*¹⁷. Other than a small area to the north, most of the Parish is in the AONB where the Local Plan gives high priority to the conservation and enhancement of its natural beauty and planning decisions should have regard to its setting. Major developments that conflict with that objective will not be permitted except in exceptional circumstances (policy LB1).

- 4.12 Concerns have been raised by statutory consultees and others as to whether the two allocations in the NP for housing and for business uses generally conform with adopted strategic housing and AONB policy. These are matters of detailed compliance and conformity which I deal with in the Specific Issues section below.
- 4.13 The NP includes policies on the village centre, local business, transport, design, and the natural and historic environment. Whilst, for the reasons explained in the following section, I consider that various modifications are needed to the Plan's policies, I would have found that the objectives of the NP generally align with the strategic development policies of the Local Plan on sustainable transport, climate change and flooding, design and the built environment, the historic environment, open space and quality of life. As such, and subject to the detailed points and suggested recommended modifications set out below, I would have considered that the NP could be brought into general conformity with the strategic policy of the Local Plan.

EU Obligations

- 4.14 I am required to consider whether the making of the Plan is in general conformity with EU obligations. The principal relevant EU obligation is under the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) and implementing regulations. A SEA Scoping Report was produced in May 2017, consulted upon, and a SEA was undertaken to inform the Plan. The Environmental Report which accompanied the Regulation 14 consultation draft is dated February 2018 and is appended to the Plan. Whilst Bridge is not required by the Local Plan to deliver a significant level of additional housing, paragraph 4.11 sets out the NP Committee's view that possible options should be explored with the potential aim of supporting the vitality of the parish and help meet local housing needs.
- 4.15 The Report describes an assessment, according to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, that explored three growth options for the parish (no further growth, some growth of between 25-75 dwellings, and significant growth of more than 75 dwellings) and five housing site allocation options. It states that these sites were ones identified by the NP Committee. Whilst they appear to be

¹⁷ Local Plan paragraph 1.51.

5 of the 6 sites identified by local landowners and the subject of public consultation in March 2016, there is very little in the Report to explain how reasonable alternatives were identified and the choice of the assessed sites.

- 4.16 The SEA was first published as an appendix to the Regulation 14 consultation draft. Although it is not clear whether the statutory bodies were formally consulted on the Environmental Report, as required by the Regulations, I note that responses from both the Environment Agency and Natural England referred to the SEA and their concerns about the proposed housing allocation (policy C3). The City Council has not raised any specific objection to the SEA Environmental Report or its conclusions, although it has queried the extent of the policy C3 allocation, which includes land proposed to be designated as Local Green Space. Others have also made representations on the detail of assessment of the SEA site options, which I address in my consideration below of the Plan's policies. Nevertheless, I consider that sufficient compliance with the requirements has been demonstrated to satisfy the Basic Condition, in terms of compatibility with the SEA Directive.
- 4.17 The Plan was screened by Canterbury City Council for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)¹⁸. It concluded that *'there are no European sites within the Neighbourhood Plan area or within close proximity or that may be adversely affected by the proposals within the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered that there are not likely to be any significant effects on any European site as a result of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan'*. Accordingly, the Screening Report, which was informed by the Local Plan HRA which contained a detailed assessment of each of the European sites in the District, concluded that HRA of the NP is not required. Natural England's letter of 7 September 2018, in response to the Regulation 16 consultation exercise on the Plan, does not suggest otherwise. On the basis of the information provided and my independent consideration, I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with the relevant EU obligations under the Habitats Directive.

Specific issues of compliance of the Plan's policies

- 4.18 Before I turn to address the individual policies, I have some general comments on the NP.

Introduction

- 4.19 The first chapter of the NP includes a brief paragraph about the parish and a vision and objectives for the NP. It is very sparse. There is an absence

¹⁸ See No. 1a) of Bridge Parish Council's Responses to the Second Set of Examiner's Questions received by IPe on 30.11.18.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

of any context and detail on the history, development, character and importance of the parish and what particular issues that the NP is intended to address. Much of the descriptive material that I would expect to see in an introductory section to the NP is contained in the Village Design Statement, which is appended to the NP. That document was produced in 2013, to advise applicants on design matters, and cannot be relied upon to describe the issues now facing the village subsequent to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2017. The Rural Community Profile produced by ACRE in 2013¹⁹, and referred to in the NP at paragraph 1.4, gives baseline evidence on population and housing, but the NP lacks any analysis of how the particular characteristics of the area have influenced the NP's objectives and policies. There is no explanation in the NP as to how the vision and objectives for the area to 2033 were drawn up; the role of public consultation in that process, nor how the vision is to be delivered through the policies and projects of the NP. This is particularly disappointing, given that similar comments were made in the 2017 healthcheck of an earlier draft. I suggest these are matters that should be addressed in any future version of the NP.

- 4.20 In addition to its 22 policies, the NP identifies 10 projects which are described as '*aspirational*'. These do not fall to be considered in this examination. Advice in the PPG²⁰ is that community projects are best included in a separate annex or companion document. Further, being set in dark green boxes, the projects appear more prominent in the text of the NP than the policies themselves, which are set in pale grey boxes. I suggest these are matters that need to be addressed in any future version of the NP. I would have recommended that the projects should be grouped in a separate chapter and clearly identified as being aspirations of the Parish Council (**RM4**).
- 4.21 The submitted NP also lacks clarity as to the status of the documents which are bound in at the back of the NP from page 32 onwards. If the NP were to be made it would form part of the statutory development plan and readers, whether developers or decision makers, should have no doubt as to what comprises the NP. Documents required to be produced by the Regulations for the examination, such as the Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement, do not form part of the NP. There is no need to append background documents, like the SEA Environmental Report, Housing Needs Survey, Rural Place Profile, and traffic survey, to the NP. Thus, I have taken the NP as submitted for examination as being pages 1-31, the Village Design Statement at Appendix A and the Cantley Ltd proposal at Appendix F.

¹⁹ ACRE is Action with Communities in Rural England, see Appendix D to the Plan.

²⁰ PPG Reference ID: 41-004-20170728.

- 4.22 In making the comments below on the policies in the NP, it is my intention that the plan makers will find them helpful as they identify a way forward. My comments and recommendations are intended to show where the Plan's policies do not meet the Basic Conditions and to suggest how such shortcomings could be overcome. I have generally limited my comments and recommendations to the NP policies themselves, but in doing so I have obviously looked to the explanatory text for the justification for the policies being proposed and the policy wording. Regrettably in many instances, that justification has been lacking. In others, matters of policy are mentioned but not taken into the policy. I urge the Parish Council if reviewing this Plan, to consider it as a whole and in any redrafting look to explain why the particular local planning context justifies the policy, and that it is supported by appropriate evidence.

Planning policies

- 4.23 The first objective of the NP is to build a strong competitive economy and ensure the vitality of the village centre. This accords with national policy which recognises town centres, and by implication village centres, as the heart of their communities and that policies should be pursued to support their viability and vitality. The NPPF supports a prosperous rural economy and requires development plan policies to promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, including local shops and public houses.
- 4.24 Bridge is identified in the Local Plan rural settlement hierarchy as a large village and a local centre. It has a variety of business premises including a Londis convenience store, but recently lost its Post Office. The NP is concerned to maintain the vitality of the village centre and through **policy A1** seeks to resist the loss of Class A premises to other uses. Local Plan policy QL3 already resists the loss of village and community facilities and I cannot see that NP policy A1 adds anything distinctive that reflects and responds to any unique local characteristics. Further, as drafted the policy lacks clarity as to what is meant by '*no longer viable*' and how the provision of '*benefits for the local economy and community equal to or greater than the current use*' would be assessed. In the absence of any justification in the supporting text, the policy is ambiguous and unclear, contrary to the advice in the PPG. As such, I would have recommended its deletion from the NP (**RM5**).
- 4.25 National policy supports economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity. **Policy A2** takes a positive approach to sustainable new development and is generally permissive of new B1 business uses in the village, subject to not leading to the loss of shops or community facilities and not harming local residential amenity. However, Bridge does not have a built-up area boundary defined in either the Local Plan or the NP and the reference in the policy to one should be deleted. Criterion iii. is unnecessary as a decision maker has to have regard to compliance with

all other relevant policies in the development plan. Accordingly, I would have recommended it should be deleted (**RM6**).

- 4.26 **Policy A3** deals with the conversion of farm buildings at Great Pett Farm for Class B1 uses. Local Plan policy EMP14 is supportive of proposals for the conversion of existing rural buildings that support the development and expansion of rural business in suitable locations in the rural areas, subject to meeting various criteria. Great Pett Farm is within the AONB where national and Local Plan policy give high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the area's natural beauty. Local Plan policy LB1 is supportive of proposals which support the economy and social well-being of the AONB and its communities, *'provided that they do not conflict with the aim of conserving and enhancing natural beauty by addressing location, scale, form, high quality design, materials and mitigation and have regard to the advice set out in the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and its supporting guidance'*.
- 4.27 The conversion of the buildings for Class B1 uses is to provide *'local work opportunities'*. The City Council has asked for these to be defined and I am unclear as to why B8 uses would not also provide such opportunities. As drafted, the policy refers to conversion being *'within the current footprint'*. This is not defined by a plan or text in the NP. In response to my question, I was provided with a plan showing 5 buildings with a total floorspace of around 2,500 square metres. Whilst this would be unlikely to be assessed as major development in the AONB, this level of floorspace could generate significant traffic movements on Pett Hill and through the village. However, the policy does not make clear as to what is meant by *'inappropriate road development'*.
- 4.28 Whilst policy A3 is in general conformity with strategic policy in the Local Plan, both the Kent Downs AONB Unit and Natural England have expressed concern about its wording and particularly the lack of sufficient criteria to ensure that development would conserve and enhance the AONB. I share that concern. As drafted, the policy lacks the necessary clarity and precision. In the absence of any useful explanatory text, anyone wishing to make a planning application would be at a loss to know what they would have to do to satisfy the policy. I would have recommended that it should be redrafted to set out clearly the extent and size of the allocation; clarify the permitted uses; provide criteria on the scale, form, design, materials and mitigation required; refer to the need to have regard to the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and supporting guidance; and address any highway and traffic issues (**RM7**).
- 4.29 In accord with national guidance, objective B and **policies B1 and B2** seek to promote sustainable transport. Bridge is served by buses going to Canterbury, Dover and Folkestone, there is a railway station one mile away at Bokesbourne, and the City park and ride is to the north, close to

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

the A2 junction. Transport infrastructure priorities in the Local Plan include a fast bus link and improved walking and cycling links and a new A2 interchange at Bridge, as part of the South Canterbury strategic allocation. Policy B1 complements the strategic transport policies of the Local Plan by requiring new development proposals to consider, at an early stage, integrating with and expanding the local cycle network and providing traffic free cycle and pedestrian routes. Whilst the A2 bypasses Bridge, taking away through traffic and there is on-street parking on the A2050, the vitality and viability of the village centre is affected by the lack of a village car park. Concerns about parking were raised during the NP's consultation and policy B2 seeks to ensure that all new development provides adequate off-street parking and resists development that would add to parking problems in the village. The policy states that *'inappropriate road development'* will not be supported, but in the absence of any explanation as to what is meant by *'inappropriate'*, I would have recommended that this part of the policy should be deleted (**RM8**).

- 4.30 The NPPF requires that neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan. The housing strategy for the rural areas of the District is set out in the Local Plan at paragraph 2.48 which states, *'Outside the urban areas, housing provision is restrained by the NPPF. The District contains villages of varying sizes and character. Some villages may have the potential for some limited minor housing development or infill development, consistent with the scale of the village'*.
- 4.31 The fourth objective of the NP is *'to maintain a choice of high-quality homes with good design'* and accords with national policy in the NPPF. Paragraph 4.1 states that the NP will encourage a limited amount of housing required to meet local needs, and paragraph 4.4 refers to the Bridge Housing Needs Survey carried out in July 2017 which identified a total need for 11 affordable homes, 5 of which were for older households, and in addition a requirement for 5 open market housing also for older households.
- 4.32 Whilst there appears to be some dispute about the number of new dwellings granted permission in recent years, this is not a matter I find determinative in respect of the housing policies in the NP. Nor do I have particular regard to paragraph 4.6 in terms of what would be considered a desirable mix of size and type of units in any new residential development. Whilst I was referred by the Parish Council to the responses to various consultations, to the Rural Community profile, and the Housing Needs Survey, I have seen nothing to indicate any local justification for a particular housing mix, other than possibly housing for older people. But clearly that need was not considered to be of such import as to warrant inclusion in policy.

- 4.33 Chapter 8 of the Local Plan addresses design and the built environment whilst Chapter 9 deals with the historic environment. The NP area contains 3 Conservation Areas and more than 60 Listed Buildings²¹ and the Village Design Statement 2013 appended to the Plan describes the distinctive character, appearance and setting of the village. **Policy C1** is concerned that all development must be designed to a high quality, responding to the heritage, landscape and locally distinctive character of Bridge as described in the Village Design Statement, and sets out 13 detailed matters to be considered. As one of the fundamental features of the village is its location within the AONB, where national and local policy require great weight to be given to conserving its landscape and natural beauty, I would have recommended that policy C1 should also include a policy criterion requiring careful consideration of the site's location within the AONB and the advice set out in the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan and its supporting guidance.
- 4.34 Criterion g) requires that sufficient garden space should be provided '*to be in keeping with the character of this rural area*'. Given the diversity of garden sizes throughout the village, which I saw on my site visit, these words are unhelpfully vague and I would have recommended that they should be deleted from the policy. Subject to these changes, policy C1 would have been in general conformity with the Local Plan policies on design and the built environment, would have had regard to national policy, and would have contributed towards the achievement of sustainable development (**RM9**).
- 4.35 Bridge straddles the flood plain of the Nail Bourne and has experienced a lot of flooding, most recently during the winter of 2013 and spring 2014, and in June 2016. In accord with the NPPF²², the Local Plan has taken account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. Chapter 7 of the Local Plan includes details on flooding problems in Bridge, including from surface water sewers and road drains not being able to cope with the amount of water, high water tables, unmaintained watercourses, high groundwater levels and emergent springs. Paragraph 7.32 notes that problems with groundwater infiltration into foul sewers along the Nail Bourne resulted in sewer surcharging adding to the effects of flooding. Policy CC4 deals with flood risk and policy CC11 requires all development proposals to include sustainable drainage provision.
- 4.36 No objection has been made by the Environment Agency or Southern Water to **policy C2**. In requiring developers to carry out pre-development investigations of drainage and sewage systems, the policy should clarify

²¹ NP paragraph 8.1.

²² NPPF paragraph 99.

that they should also identify any potential increase in flood hazard in Bridge and surrounding areas which might result from the development. Subject to the addition of the underlined word, the policy would have met the Basic Conditions (**RM10**). In view of my comments below on policy E1, in any future version of the NP consideration should be given to moving this policy to the chapter on climate change.

- 4.37 The Local Plan does not allocate any housing sites in Bridge. However, policy SP4 sets out a hierarchical approach to development identifying Bridge as a local centre where the provision of new housing that is of a size, design, scale, character and location appropriate to its character and built form *'will be supported provided that such proposals are not in conflict with other local plan policies relating to transport, environmental and flood zone protection and design, and those of the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan, where applicable'*.
- 4.38 To promote sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF advises that housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. All settlements in rural areas are identified in the PPG as being capable of playing a role in delivering sustainable development. The SEA referred to the view of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee that possible options for growth should be explored *'with the potential aim of supporting the vitality of the parish and help meet local housing needs'*²³.
- 4.39 **Policy C3** provides for the allocation of land between the recreation ground and the A2 *'for a village hall, sports pitches, recreational play areas and undeveloped land for recreational use'*, as well as for up to 40 homes, to include 30% affordable housing for local people. The allocation is controversial, eliciting objections about its selection and suitability from local residents as well as representations from Natural England, Historic England, the Kent Downs AONB Unit, and Southern Water and comments from both the planning and the land-owning departments of the City Council.
- 4.40 Contrary to the view of the Local Plan Inspector, I am of the same mind as the AONB Unit that a development of a maximum of 40 units on this greenfield site, would represent major development in the AONB. It is longstanding national policy that major development in the AONB should be refused *'except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest'*. Matters to be included in that assessment include the need for the development, whether the need could be met in some other way, and any detrimental effect on the

²³ SEA paragraph 4.11.

environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated²⁴.

- 4.41 In its response to questions in my second letter, the Parish Council set out its case for the proposed development: in particular the expiry of the Recreation Ground lease in 2023 and potential loss of a very significant share of the village's recreational assets, and the significant other benefits seen as accruing from the proposals including affordable housing, space for a new village hall and a car park, which are offered by the local landowners²⁵. It argued that the proposals described in Cantley's proposals at Appendix F sit within the terms '*public interest*' and '*exceptional circumstances*'. However, the fact of the matter is that the NP as drafted provides no justification at all for major development in the AONB or for the proposals in the policy, or any explanation for the land transfer requirement. Further, as allocated housing sites are not rural exception sites under Local Plan policy HD3, the local connection criteria referred to in policy C3 would not apply to any affordable housing. Paragraph 2.5 of the '*Allocation of accommodation: guidance for local housing authorities in England*' (2012)²⁶ explains that s.166A of the Housing Act 1996 (as amended) ensures certain categories are given reasonable preference. It states that authorities must have regard to their homelessness and tenancy strategies when framing their allocation scheme. In paragraph 3.20, it states that '*in framing their qualification criteria, authorities will need to have regard to their duties under the equalities legislation, as well as the requirement in s.166A(3) to give overall priority for an allocation to people in the reasonable preference category*'. Thus, in my view, as the site is not a rural exception site where use of a local connection criteria is acceptable, the process of allocating social housing is a matter for housing management and not planning policy.
- 4.42 I also have serious concerns about the potential developability and deliverability of the policy proposals²⁷, which I am not satisfied that the SEA has addressed with sufficient rigour. I share Historic England's concern that there has been no critical assessment of the potential impact of development on the AONB, the landscape setting of the village or on the Bifrons Park and Bridge Conservation Areas. The AONB Unit has commented that the development as proposed, by straddling an established field boundary, would fail to respond to the existing landscape

²⁴ NPPF paragraph 116. [Although not relevant to this examination, I note that the NPPF July 2018 in paragraph 172 confirms that '*the scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited*'.]

²⁵ Parish Clerk's response received by email on 30 November 2018 in response to my letter of 13 November 2018.

²⁶ View at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/allocation-of-accommodation-guidance-for-local-housing-authorities-in-england>

²⁷ PPG Reference ID: 41-005-20140306.

structure. Indeed, one of the views that the NP itself seeks to preserve via policy F4 looks north west across the Nail Bourne valley to the allocation site. With part of the site shown to be within Flood Zones 2 and 3, it is unclear whether the Sequential Test, which has the aim to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding, has been properly applied. Southern Water has identified an increased risk of flooding, unless network reinforcement is undertaken.

- 4.43 Access to the site from Patricxbourne Road would require a bridge over the Nail Bourne, and the development would have the potential to increase traffic movements at the awkward junction by the Red Lion, whilst the access shown to Conyngham Lane would be via the private road to the Primary School. There is also an internal conflict within the NP with the potential new village hall site, shown on land that policy F3 identifies as Local Green Space and protects from development. I am not satisfied that the proposals as currently advanced have regard to national policy or are in general conformity with strategic Local Plan policies, in particular policies SP4 and LB1.
- 4.44 I am aware that the Parish vote held in November 2017 gave positive support for the Cantley's proposals, and that if they were to be carried forward there would be benefits for the community as a whole. However, my concern is at what cost? And, whether that cost has been properly, openly and fully assessed as part of the plan making process, in order to be able to determine where the balance lies – in favour of the development or not? As I am not convinced that that exercise has been completed here, if the NP were proceeding to referendum (which I am recommending it should not), it would have been my recommendation that policy C3 is deleted from the NP as it fails to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development and thus would not have met the Basic Conditions (**RM11**).
- 4.45 **Policy C4** accords with national and local strategic policy in seeking to encourage development on previously developed land. However as drafted the policy appears to set some form of sequential test, requiring developers to first investigate all brownfield options, then if none are suitable, prove an overriding need for a greenfield site and only then will permission be granted if the development would benefit the village as a whole. There is no explanation within the NP's supporting text for the policy and I find it to be unclear, imprecise and unsupported by any evidence justifying it in terms of local circumstances. To meet the Basic Conditions, I would have recommended that it should be deleted from the NP (**RM12**).

- 4.46 In accord with the NPPF²⁸, the Local Plan at paragraph 8.25 onwards addresses concerns about residential intensification and the impact that infilling and redevelopment can have on established residential areas. Through **policy C5**, the NP seeks to resist what is described in the NP as '*garden grabbing*'. The policy seeks to ensure that new dwellings respect existing separation distances, local settings and densities, and existing garden sizes. Subject to changes to the policy wording to clarify how it would be applied, I consider that policy C5 would have met the Basic Conditions (**RM13**).
- 4.47 **Policy C6** requires proposals for development to include the submission of ecological surveys and mitigation strategies for habitats and protected/notable species. The City Council is critical of the policy both in terms of its policy wording and requirements and the lack of an explanation in the supporting text. Chapter 10 of the Local Plan includes a raft of policies on biodiversity and in the absence of any specific local justification for policy C6, I would have recommended that it should be removed from the NP (**RM14**).
- 4.48 Bridge is a significant settlement on the route of Watling Street, a major Roman road, at the bridging point of the Nail Bourne and there are many historic sites and buildings in the parish. The City Council has recommended the rewording of **policy C7** to reflect the City Council's archaeology procedures. Subject to that change, I am satisfied that the policy would have been in general conformity with strategic policies, would have had regard to national guidance and would have met the Basic Conditions (**RM15**).
- 4.49 Chapter 5 of the NP has the objective of promoting healthy communities. National policy recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities and Local Plan policies QL3 and QL6 are concerned with retaining local community facilities and services. **Policy D1** would only permit the loss of community services and facilities in certain circumstances. However, the City Council has queried what is meant in the policy by '*of equal or high quality and value to the community*' and '*provide equal or greater benefits to the local economy and community*'. Neither qualification is defined in the policy or in any supporting text. I am not satisfied that the policy is drafted with sufficient clarity such that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications²⁹. Either the policy should be substantially rewritten and provided with explanatory text or, given that these matters are already addressed in the Local Plan, I would have recommended that it should be deleted from the NP (**RM16**).

²⁸ NPPF paragraph 53.

²⁹ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

- 4.50 **Policy D2** is concerned with public rights of way, important Local Green Spaces and green infrastructure around the village which contribute to the health and wellbeing of the residents. In that it accords with national and strategic local policy, it would contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development and meets the Basic Conditions.
- 4.51 Chapter 5 of the NP is concerned with meeting the challenges of climate change and flooding and **policy E1** requires that all development proposals need to be supported by a surface water management strategy, which uses sustainable drainage system features. The Environment Agency, as a statutory consultee and the authority responsible for taking a strategic overview of the management of all sources of flooding, has welcomed the consideration of flood risk and surface water management in this chapter. However, it does not support the policy wording which fails to mention the general presumption for the avoidance of development within areas, like Bridge, prone to flooding. Whilst sustainable drainage is important, it should only be used on sites that have been demonstrably shown to be appropriate for development in the first place.
- 4.52 Paragraph 6.5 is misleading in implying that development might be supported in Flood Zones 2 and 3, with appropriate flood mitigation measures. That is not the case. National policy sets out clearly the presumption that all development should be located outside of any area identified to be at flood risk. Policies CC4 and CC5 in the Local Plan deal with flood risk and flood zones where new development will only be permitted where it satisfies the requirements of the Sequential Test. If development is exceptionally permitted, necessary mitigation measures would require no loss of any floodplain or conveyance capacity and safe access/egress.
- 4.53 Moreover in terms of NP policy E1, there is likely to be difficulty in this location with the viability of a surface water management scheme that is required to discharge solely to the ground. The Nail Bourne is a groundwater fed ephemeral watercourse and it only flows during periods of elevated groundwater levels. During such periods, any soakage feature is not likely to operate effectively and the Environment Agency has advised it may act as a direct pathway for contaminants to reach the underlying aquifer. Southern Water, as a wastewater company, has also made representations on Chapter 6. Whilst it is also concerned with the impacts of flooding on its network, paragraph 6.3 is incorrect to say that it is responsible for the '*major improvements*' as these relate to land drainage issues.
- 4.54 I understand that the challenges of climate change and the past flooding of the Nail Bourne, groundwater infiltration and sewer surcharging, graphically illustrated in the photos on pages 20 and 21, are of great

concern to those living in Bridge. However, as drafted Chapter 6 of the Plan and policy E1 fail to have adequate regard to national and strategic policy on flooding and the use of sustainable drainage systems. It is not capable of being modified without complete rewriting and I would have recommended that it should be deleted from the NP (**RM17**). If such a chapter is to be included in any future version of the NP, I suggest that further consultation is required with the responsible bodies including Kent County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.

- 4.55 Bridge is a rural parish within the AONB and policies in Chapter 7 are concerned with conserving and enhancing its attractive natural environment. Substantial development is planned at South Canterbury to the north of the parish, including improvements to the A2 junction, and policy OS6 of the Local Plan identifies a Green Gap between Canterbury and Bridge. There is a clear sense of leaving the City when travelling southward, entering the countryside, and then looking down the hill and moving into the separate settlement of Bridge. To retain the individual identities of the settlements and avoid Bridge becoming a suburb of Canterbury, NP **policy F1** will not support development that reduces that sense of openness and separation between Bridge and Canterbury. The policy is in general conformity with the strategic policy and meets the Basic Conditions.
- 4.56 In requiring that additional development in the village will only be supported where sustainable significant overall benefit to the village or exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, the City Council has argued that **policy F2** is overly restrictive and could preclude otherwise acceptable development. I agree and I would have supported the alternative wording suggested by the City Council that would be consistent with Local Plan policy SP4 (**RM18**).
- 4.57 **Policy F3** deals with the protection of important Local Green Spaces in the village. However as there is no defined 'envelope' for the village, I would have recommended that this word should be deleted from the NP (**RM19**). By designating land as Local Green Space (LGS), the NPPF at paragraph 76 explains that local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as LGS should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. They should be capable of enduring beyond the Plan period. Criteria on LGSs are set out in the NPPF at paragraph 77 and there is further advice in the PPG³⁰. Policy F3 designates 7 open spaces as LGSs, which are listed in the schedule on page 26 and identified on the map on page 25.

³⁰ PPG Reference IDs: 37-005-20140306 to 37-022-20140306.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

- 4.58 Whilst the schedule numbers the sites, these numbers have not been transposed onto the map. In response to my request, the Parish Council provided me with a map numbering the LGSs. However as there are notable inconsistencies between the maps in respect of four of the LGSs, I have had to rely on the map in the NP. Descriptions and assessments of spaces against the NPPF criteria are provided in the NP Evidence Documents. Having regard to this evidence, and what I saw on my site visit, I am satisfied that the following spaces are local in character, not extensive tracts of land, are demonstrably special and are in close proximity to the community they serve. They could therefore be listed in policy F3. They are: Church Meadow (1), land along Patricxbourne Road at the entrance to Riverside Close (4), the allotments (5), the village recreation ground (6) and the roadside areas along Western Avenue (7).
- 4.59 The NPPF cautions that LGS designation will not be appropriate for most green spaces or open space and I have carefully considered what part of the fields and water meadows along Brewery Lane and Mill Lane between the Brickfields and the Nail Bourne (2) and (3) could be included as LGS under policy F3. My consideration has been made more difficult by the map in the NP showing rather different areas to that coloured green and numbered on the later map provided to me. Having regard to the NPPF designation criteria, the descriptions given in the assessments and in the NP of the different areas, and what I saw on my site visit, I do not consider that the field immediately east of Brickfields off Mill Lane meets the LGS criteria. Unlike the water meadows, which are well used by dog walkers and local residents, are clearly valued by the community, and hold a particular local significance, this field is on rising ground, is used as a paddock and is not crossed by any public rights of way. I have seen nothing to indicate why it would be demonstrably special to the local community or that it holds any particular local significance.
- 4.60 The field is owned by the City Council, adjoins Brickfields (a rural exception housing site), and is part of Site E assessed for housing in the SEA. I am also mindful that the LGS designation should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and should not be used as a means to prevent development. Therefore, I would have recommended, subject to a modification to delete all of the field immediately east of Brickfields from the LGS designation, that sites (2) and (3) (as shown on the map in the NP) comprising the water meadows along Brewery Lane and the Nail Bourne and stretching southward from Mill Lane meet the LGS criteria. With that modification and the LGS map corrected, I would have considered that policy F3 would appropriately provide for the designation and protection of LGSs, in accordance with national policy (**RM20**).
- 4.61 Government policy is that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, amongst other things, by

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. Most of the NP area is in the AONB and subject to the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty³¹. Strategic Local Plan policy addresses planning decisions in the AONB which should have regard to its setting. The character of Bridge is defined, in a large part, by its situation in the Nail Bourne valley and the attractive views from the rising countryside around the village, of the church, the village and the valley.

- 4.62 Six valued views are identified in the NP at page 27 around the village, which **policy F4** requires development to seek to preserve or enhance. There is also a map on page 28 which identifies seven (not six) viewpoints, shows the angle and direction of view and has a photograph of the view. Apart from there being one more view, the views of the map are not numbered and their descriptions do not match with those views 1 to 6 listed on page 27. In response to my request for clarification, the Parish Council provided me with another map, but one which had a different set of viewpoints and different photos. Whilst the viewpoints on the new map appear to correlate with the views listed on page 27 of the Plan, I have not been provided with an explanation of the discrepancy in the actual NP.
- 4.63 The mismatch between the list and the map is capable of correction, but in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate what makes these particular views important or special, I find that policy F4 lacks the necessary clarity for a decision maker to be able to apply it consistently and with confidence in determining planning applications. I would have concluded that policy F4, the accompanying list and map on page 28, should be deleted (**RM21**), in that it fails to have sufficient regard to the advice contained in the Secretary of State's guidance and would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 4.64 It is national policy to limit the impact of light pollution³² and policies SD6 and SD7 in the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan support 'dark skies' and tranquillity. As NP policy C1 requires all development to be designed to a high quality, and criterion k) specifically refers to '*avoiding unacceptable levels of light, noise, air or water pollution, and protecting the tranquillity and dark night skies of the area*', I am not persuaded that there is any need for the separate **policy F5**. I would have recommended its deletion from the NP (**RM22**).
- 4.65 **Policy F6** encourages the provision of allotment and community gardens or orchards within new development and is supportive of sustainable farming and farm shops. Local Plan policy QL4 is supportive of farm shops, whilst Local Plan policy OS15 addresses the loss of allotments. As

³¹ NPPF paragraph 115.

³² NPPF paragraph 125.

drafted, policy F6 reads as an aspiration rather than a development plan policy to manage the use and development of land. As such, I do not consider it has had sufficient regard to the Secretary of State's guidance on the drafting of policies in neighbourhood plans. The Parish Council may wish to consider renaming it as a project, but otherwise I would have recommended its deletion from the NP (**RM23**).

- 4.66 There are 3 Conservation Areas in the parish and numerous listed buildings as well as known, and as yet undiscovered, archaeological sites and finds. In accord with national and strategic local policy, the NP has the objective of conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The Village Design Statement produced in 2013 is appended to the NP and **policy G1** requires that new development should complement the building designs described in the Statement, in order to respect the existing village character and appearance in terms of scale, style, and setting. Paragraph 8.4 is concerned that materials are also carefully monitored and 'materials' should also be included in policy G1 after '*designs*'. Subject to that modification, I would have considered that policy G1 would contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development and would have met the Basic Conditions (**RM24**).


5. Conclusions

- 5.1 For the reasons set out above, I have concluded that the NP has not been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. Whilst parts of the Plan comply with the statutory requirements, I am not satisfied that, within the remit of this examination, the NP has had regard to national policies and advice contained in the advice and guidance issued by the Secretary of State in respect of the consultation and engagement on the draft Plan, as required under the Basic Condition in paragraph 8(2)(a) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. Further, I have found that the consultation statement submitted fails, in my view, to meet the requirements of Regulation 15(2) of the 2012 Regulations in respect of the prescribed content of a consultation statement. There are also a number of other matters in the Plan and its policies that do not, as drafted, meet the relevant legal requirements.
- 5.2 I understand that these conclusions will be very disappointing to the Parish Council, the City Council, and to the people of Bridge who have worked hard over a period of time on the Neighbourhood Plan and to achieve the best for their village. Whilst the Parish Council's initiative is to be commended in progressing the first neighbourhood plan in Canterbury district for examination, it is with regret that I have no alternative but to reach the conclusion that the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to a Referendum.

- 5.3 In order to be helpful, I have indicated the recommended modifications I would have made to the Plan and its policies, had I been able to overcome the two consultation related failings. In doing so, I hope the Parish Council will be in a better position to decide how it might wish to take forward the Neighbourhood Plan in the future.

6. Formal Recommendation

- 6.1 I recommend to Canterbury City Council, in accord with paragraph 10(2)(c) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, that the proposal for the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan should be refused and not proceed to a Referendum.
- 6.2 As I have recommended that the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to a Referendum, I make no recommendation in relation to the Referendum Area.



Examiner

Appendix: Non Statutory Modifications

Important Note: As set out in paragraph 3.22 of the main report, these recommended modifications are intended to be advisory only and have no intended legal status in relation to paragraph 10(2)(b) of Schedule 4B of the 1990 Act.

| Recommended modification number (RM) | Plan page no./ other reference | Modification |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| RM1 | Page 3 | Paragraph 1.1 of the NP should confirm that the NP was prepared and submitted by the Parish Council and it would help to make clear those to whom 'our vision' in paragraph 1.1 of the Plan is intended to refer. |
| RM2 | Front cover and Page 3 | The NP period should be aligned with that of the adopted Local Plan and the period to which the NP is to take effect should be clearly set out on the front cover. |
| RM3A and 3B | Page 39 | The Basic Conditions Statement should include an assessment of each of the Plan's policies against the policies contained within the NPPF and provide an analysis of how the policies in the NP comply with and build on the strategic policies of the Local Plan. |
| RM4 | Throughout the Plan | The projects should be grouped in a separate chapter and clearly identified as being aspirations of the Parish Council. |
| RM5 | Page 6 | Delete policy A1. |
| RM6 | Page 7 | Delete criterion iii. from policy A2. |
| RM7 | Page 7 | Redraft policy A3 to set out clearly the extent and size of the allocation; clarify the permitted uses; provide criteria on the scale, form, design, materials and mitigation required; refer to the need to have regard to the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan |

| | | |
|------|---------|---|
| | | and supporting guidance; and address any highway and traffic issues. |
| RM8 | Page 11 | In policy B2 delete the words 'or which would require inappropriate road development'. |
| RM9 | Page 13 | In policy C1 g) delete the words 'to be in keeping with the character of this rural area'. |
| RM10 | Page 13 | In policy C2 add the word 'identify' before 'any potential increase in flood hazard in Bridge'. |
| RM11 | Page 14 | Delete policy C3. |
| RM12 | Page 15 | Delete policy C4. |
| RM13 | Page 15 | Amend the wording of policy C5 to clarify how it would be applied. |
| RM14 | Page 15 | Delete policy C6. |
| RM15 | Page 16 | Redraft policy C7 as follows: <i>Where appropriate, proposals for new development should carry out an initial archaeological assessment to establish if an archaeological investigation is required.</i> |
| RM16 | Page 18 | Delete policy D1. |
| RM17 | Page 20 | Delete policy E1. |
| RM18 | Page 24 | Redraft policy F2 as follows: <i>Additional development within the village will be supported if it meets the aims of sustainable development and promotes healthy and safe communities.</i> |
| RM19 | Page 25 | Delete the word 'envelope' from policy F3. |
| RM20 | Page 25 | On the Map of Important Local Green Spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the LGS designation from the field to the south of Mill |

| | | |
|------|-----------------|--|
| | | <p>Lane, east of the housing at Brickfields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number the 7 LGSs on the map. |
| RM21 | Pages 27 and 28 | Delete policy F4, the list of views on page 27 and the map on page 28. |
| RM22 | Page 29 | Delete policy F5. |
| RM23 | Page 29 | Delete policy F6. |
| RM24 | Page 30 | In policy G1 add the word 'materials' after 'designs' in line 2. |

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Mary T O'Rourke BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Philip Wicker
Clerk to Bridge Parish Council

Lisa Gadd
Senior Planning Policy Officer
Planning Policy & Heritage
Canterbury City Council

Examination Ref: 01/MOR/BNP

9 October 2018

Dear Mr Wicker and Ms Gadd

BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters. I also have a number of preliminary questions for Bridge Parish Council and Canterbury City Council.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I have received the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations. Subject to the necessary clarification being received in answer to my attached questions, it appears that I will have what I need to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the draft plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in the Plan that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I intend to undertake a site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area during the week commencing 15 October 2018. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The site visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing

should a matter(s) come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

4. Further Clarification

I have a number of initial questions seeking further clarification, which I have set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if you can seek to provide a written response within the next 2 weeks.

Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan.

As I have raised a number of questions I must provide both Canterbury City Council and Bridge Parish Council with sufficient opportunity to reply. Consequentially, the examination timetable will be extended. Please be assured that I will seek to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

If you have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter, and any responses to my questions, are placed on the Parish and City Councils' websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the examiner.

Examiner

ANNEX

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft June 2018 - Examiner's Preliminary Questions

From my initial reading of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence I have a number of preliminary questions primarily directed to Bridge Parish Council (BPC), with the exception of question 7 specifically directed to Canterbury City Council. I have requested the submission of responses within two weeks of receipt of this letter but an earlier response would be welcome.

1. When was the decision taken by BPC to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan?
2. On what date was the formal application for designation as a Neighbourhood Plan Area made to Canterbury City Council?
3. Please provide further detail on the work carried out in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, in addition to the information given in an attachment to the Plan (the page before the Glossary). When was the Plan Committee established? How many members did/does it have? How were they selected? Where can I find details of their meetings, minutes, etc?
4. I have a single bound document entitled the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft June 2018 at the back of which there is, in addition to six appendices A to F, a number of other documents. Page 32 is described as The Consultation Statement, and at page 39 a Basic Conditions Statement. Please clarify those parts of the June 2018 Consultation Draft that are not intended to form part of the Neighbourhood Plan that I am to examine, and which the Parish Council are asking to proceed to referendum and be made.
5. There is a consultation statement attached to the Plan (pages 32 to 38). However, as a simple timeline which finishes at 27 April 2017, it does not give the detail that I would expect to see to be able to be satisfied that consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan has followed a transparent, fair and inclusive process, which has had regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance on plan preparation and in procedural compliance with the legal requirements. Please could you direct me to where I can find more detail of the consultation exercises that were carried out during the preparation of the Plan, detail of the responses received, and of the relevant issues identified that have directed the policies and proposals now found in the Plan.
6. Please confirm the dates of the Regulation 14 consultation and where I can find information on any representations made as a result of that consultation and on any response by the Parish Council to those representations, including changes proposed to the Plan and its policies.
7. Can Canterbury City Council please confirm the dates and period of the Regulation 16 consultation.
8. Please provide a plan showing the boundaries of the Conservation Areas in the parish and the dates of the respective designations.
9. Please provide a plan showing that part of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which lies within the parish.

10. Policy F3 of the Plan seeks to protect seven Important Local Green Spaces which are shown on the map on page 25 of the Plan. Whilst the spaces are numbered on the schedule on page 26, they are not identified by their numbers on the map. Please provide a corrected map showing the spaces by number.
11. Policy F4 of the Plan identifies 6 views to be preserved or enhanced, and these are numbered and their locations described in writing on page 27 of the Plan. There is also a map and photographs on page 28 showing 'Views towards the village'. However, the views on that map are not numbered and their descriptions do not match with those of views 1 to 6 on page 27. Please clarify this confusion and, if necessary, provide me with an amended map.
12. Policy G1 refers to the Village Design Statement which is appended to the Plan as Appendix A. It would be helpful to have more detail on the status of that Statement, when it was prepared, who by, how it was consulted on, and whether it replaced an earlier document.

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Mary T O'Rourke BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Examination Ref: 02/MOR/BNP

Philip Wicker
Clerk to Bridge Parish Council

Lisa Gadd
Senior Planning Policy Officer
Planning Policy and Heritage
Canterbury City Council

13 November 2018

Dear Mr Wicker and Ms Gadd

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Examination

I refer to your responses of 24 October 2018 to my first procedural letter and preliminary questions of 9 October 2018.

I am writing to identify, at this stage, an issue of procedural compliance, in that I am seriously concerned that the consultation statement which accompanies the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan fails to comply with the legal requirements set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ('the 2012 Regulations'). As the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) explains, the qualifying body should be open and inclusive in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan and ensure that the wider community is kept fully informed of what is being proposed; is able to make their views known throughout the process; has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan and is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan¹. The consultation statement submitted with the draft neighbourhood plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the plan proposals². It should contain details of those consulted; explain how they were consulted; summarise the main issues and concerns raised, and describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the neighbourhood plan³.

I note that in response to my question, the timeline included in the consultation statement has been brought up to date and a column added on 'changes made as a result of feedback given'. However, unless the reader interrogates minutes, reports and documents held on the Council's website, there is a lack of clarity as to when and how the local community was consulted and what it was asked for its views about, what responses were received, what issues and concerns were raised, and how those informed the drafting of the neighbourhood plan. I have to conclude that I am not satisfied that the consultation statement as submitted provides the clear and auditable narrative that I would expect to see to demonstrate compliance with the Regulatory requirements and the need to have regard to the advice in the PPG. This shortcoming could lead to me being unable to recommend that the Plan proceeds to referendum.

¹ PPG Reference ID: 41-047-20140306.

² PPG Reference ID: 41-007-20170728.

³ Regulation 15(2) of the 2012 Regulations.


In your consideration of this matter, you may find it helpful to look at the advice in the March 2018 'Guidance to service users and examiners'⁴, which has been produced by representatives from the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS), the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE), Locality and the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

In addition, I have further questions about the Plan, set out in the attached Annex, a number of which are in respect of the evidence that supports the Plan's policies.

I would be grateful if you would provide a written response to this letter and to the Annex questions within the next 2 weeks.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the examiner.

Examiner

⁴ <https://www.rics.org/globalassets/rics-website/media/upholding-professional-standards/regulation/drs/drs-services/npiers-planning-guidance-to-service-users-and-examiners-rics.pdf>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft June 2018

Examiner's Second Set of Questions

1. The Basic Conditions Statement refers to the Neighbourhood Plan committee as having regard to relevant EU obligations. Please provide:
 - a) the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening report; and
 - a) a statement as to whether the Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and compliance with the Human Rights Act 1998.
2. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) appended to the Plan gives its timescale as to 2031, however, the Plan has an end date of 2033. Please explain and correct this discrepancy.
3. The SEA at paragraph 4.11 onwards describes the SEA process which considered three broad options relating to the scale of housing delivery to be taken forward for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please advise as to how/when/why these 3 broad options were arrived at by the Neighbourhood Plan committee and if/when they were the subject of public consultation and the result of that consultation.
4. Please provide information on the vote held by the Parish Council on 25 November 2017 on Cantley Ltd's development proposals, including details of any plans provided with the proposals, and the results of the ballot. Please confirm that the document at Annex 1 to Paul Ferguson's consultation response was sent by the Parish Council to each household prior to the ballot.
5. Please provide copies of the appendices to the Regulation 14 consultation draft of the Plan as these do not appear to be available on the Council's web site.
6. Policy A2 refers to proposals for new B1 development being permitted 'within the built up area boundary of Bridge'. In the absence of any such boundary being shown on a Proposals Map how is it proposed to implement this policy?
7. Policy A3 supports the conversion of buildings at Great Pett Farm to B1 uses. In the interests of clarity, please provide evidence including a plan showing the current footprint of the farm buildings and their floor area.
8. What is the evidence to support the mix of new housing described in paragraph 4.6?
9. Policy C3 covers land between the recreation land and the A2 and described in the policy as being set out in 'Policy C3 Map and in the Proposal contained within Appendix F'. Please confirm that the allocated site includes the SEA site C plus the southern part of SEA site B.
10. Policy C3 allocates land for development including up to 40 homes. As major development in the AONB, where and what is the evidence that the development has been assessed against the criteria set out in the NPPF (2012)⁵ at paragraph 116?
11. In the absence of any supporting text in the Plan to explain the requirement in policy C3 for the transfer of the recreation ground to the Parish Council or the other proposals set out in the leaflet at Appendix F to the Plan, how is the policy justified?
12. In respect of policy D1, please provide more detail as to the community services and facilities of use to the community, the loss of which the policy seeks to resist. In the absence of any supporting text to explain how the policy is intended to be applied, please clarify what is meant by 'of an equal or higher quality and value' and 'provide equal or greater benefits to the local economy or community'.

⁵ The NPPF (2012) is the applicable policy by virtue of the transitional arrangements in paragraph 214 of the revised NPPF (2018)

13. What is the Parish Council's response to the concerns raised by the Environment Agency in its representations dated 7 September 2018 about the wording of policy E1 and supporting text, compliance with national policy and the application of the sequential test in respect of sites D and E in the SEA?
14. As noted in the responses to my preliminary questions, please provide hard copies of the revised maps showing the policy F3 Local Green Spaces, identified by their numbers, and the policy F4 views, correctly numbered and described.
15. In respect of policy F4, please provide evidence as to why these views are considered to be particularly important to the setting of the village.

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Bridge Parish Council Thursday 11th November 2021
held at 7.30 p.m. in Bridge Village Hall

PRESENT Cllr A Atkinson (Chair), Cllr Fawke, Cllr R Atkinson, Cllr Kirk, Cllr Cook, Cllr Ferguson, Cllr Spencer and the Clerk Jennifer Heap.

At the beginning a Mr Cramer addressed the Council. Mr Cramer expressed the importance of asking the right legal questions from a legal expert in context of the village's situation regarding the recreation ground. Mr Cramer asked that the questions previously submitted to the Council be given appropriate consideration. Mr Cramer feels there is opportunity to challenge the land owner as a result research conducted. Mr Cramer does not feel the threat is realistic and the courts would find in the village's favour. Cllr A Atkinson advised this would be discussed under item 3 'Matters for discussion and Action'.

56/21-22 Apologies for absence, Cllr Moon, Cllr Shirley & Cllr Sole

57/21-22 Declaration of Interest & Lobbying and written Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
None.

58/21-22 The minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 14th October 2021 were confirmed as a true record, signed and dated by the Chair.

59/21-22 Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 14th October not dealt with under item 6 of the agenda.

Cllr Cook reported that he had a walk about with Cllr Sole to discuss parking restrictions. It was felt that some parking restrictions within the village do not achieve much. Cllr Cook advised CCC would consider a short stretch of double yellow lines on the corner of Dering Close and Dering Road. CCC would also consider moving the double yellow lines by the allotments to the other side of the road to allow for extra parking. These proposals will be submitted to the Joint Transportation Board (Please refer to min ref 52/21-22 under 'Matters for discussion and action', item 5). Cllr Cook advised that in order for KCC to consider making Aunt Betsy's Hill and the bottom of Union road one way, the scheme would need to be added to BPC's Highway Improvement Plan (HIP). Cllr's agreed to this suggestion.

Cllr Fawke updated on behalf of Cllr Sole that a drain cleansing operation is due this month.

60/21-22 Report from City and Kent Councillor Mike Sole


Parish Council Report – 'November 2021 (an update on what I have been doing in October)

Autumn is now well and truly here, and the heavy rain is highlighting the many blocked gullies that KCC have failed to clear despite several requests over several months. I continue to chase to these to be done.

Parish Council Meetings – *With 16 parish councils in my KCC division it isn't possible to attend all of them regularly.*

In October I was able to attend the following parish council meetings:

Chartham (annual assembly) – *It was good to be able to attend this meeting and meet up with local community groups as well as find out more about the work that is going on with the Neighbourhood Plan.*

Adisham – *I was really pleased to see the new dishwasher in the village hall that was purchased with KCC grant funding and also meet new and prospective parish councillors. I also seem to have found myself a very responsible job to do in the village on Christmas morning too .*

Wickhambreaux (annual assembly) – *This meeting included a presentation about Speedwatch which is something that I hope to get more enthusiasm for in many parishes.*

Bridge – *I discussed parking and other issues with the parish council with a view to requesting several changes in the village to Canterbury City Council.*

Parking Restrictions – *If any parish wishes to put forward changes to the City Council parking restrictions, then deadline for this is 31 December, although it would be helpful to have them earlier than that.*

National Farmers Union – I had a very informative meeting with members of the Canterbury NFU. As a result of this I am following up matters including fly-tipping and ragwort.

Canterbury City Council meetings attended in the month were the Regeneration Committee and full Council.

In **Wincheap** there is a significant concern about the proposed gyratory scheme (Wincheap becomes one way as does Simmonds Road) as there has been no public consultation about the impact on residents and businesses. I have also, (so far unsuccessfully) tried to reduce the night-time anti-social construction work on the A2 slip road in **Thanington** – unfortunately neither CCC nor KCC have direct power over Highways England.

I have had fruitful discussions with KCC about setting up an **apprentice's bus travel scheme**.

On **flooding** I have had meetings with both the River Stour Internal Drainage Board and The Little Stour, Nailbourne, Petham Bourne Flood Action Group.

Fly-tipping again seems to be increasing and Canterbury City Council are very slow to deal with reported items, some still outstanding several months later – I continue to chase for action'.

61/21-22 Disposal of business from the last meeting

Recreation Ground –

The Clerk updated that the new play equipment is ready and should be installed before Christmas.

Neighbourhood Plan –

Cllr's A Atkinson and Cook attended a meeting with Charlie Gooch the agent for Cantley Estates and the proposed developers. Mr Gooch presented an amended planned layout for the proposed development (previously circulated to Cllrs). Following advice from a Highways Consultant that it is not advisable to mix school with residential traffic, a road through to Patricxbourne Rd has been introduced. Due to the cost of building a new road and bridge, the combined contribution towards the cost of the village hall is now a minimum of £200,000. Cantley are awaiting a final costing for the additional work before giving a final contribution figure to the village.

Since the last meeting of the NP Committee, BPC has received a response from Cantley regarding concerns raised at the last NP Committee meeting on 18th October. Cllr A Atkinson advised that Cantley Ltd will not develop any further sites during the life of the NP if the developments within the NP go ahead. Cantley have also confirmed that if the lease expires without agreement then a new one off new lease would be granted for 15 years on similar terms except for the rent. Cantley is awaiting legal advice on what would happen after this additional lease expires.

Please also refer to item '3' under 'Matters for discussion and Action'.

62/21-22 Reports from Representatives to Outside Bodies

Cllr A Atkinson attended a KALC meeting to discuss the Parish Charter. A draft document is being circulated to the Parishes before being sent to CCC for comment.

Cllr A Atkinson attended a meeting with CCC at the Guildhall regarding Concurrent Funding. CCC's audit has stalled and therefore the CFF will remain the same for next year and the amount received for the following two years will receive an inflationary increase although that figure has yet to be determined.

63/21-22 Matters for discussion and action

1. Cllr Fawke – To discuss the outcome of the Ford Close Consultation. Results previously circulated. Cllr Fawke acknowledged the responses and announced option 3 received the majority of votes i.e. have an area of wild flowers (wildlife corridor) as per Option 1 and then keep the rest of the area more maintained and install fencing as per Option 2. The next step is to gain permission from KCC and meet with KCC's Tree Officer. Cllr Fawke proposed a motion

for BPC to accept the outcome of the Consultation and make the necessary arrangements. BPC voted unanimously to the proposal. Clerk and Cllr Fawke to action.

2. Cllr A Atkinson – To Approve BPC's budget and precept request for 22/23. Previously Circulated. The Council unanimously voted to accept the budget and to make a precept request of £34,000. Clerk to make the request.
3. Cllr A Atkinson – To vote on funding legal advice regarding the recreation ground lease and if approved to vote on which quotation to accept. Details previously circulated. Cllr Cook proposed BPC agree to spend £500 on legal advice and to give permission for the Clerk to spend a further £500 if required. Cllr Cook proposed a further motion for the Clerk to approach the legal experts listed as 3 and 4 and allocate the work to the adviser able to respond to the questions within the shortest timeframe. BPC unanimously agreed to both proposals. Clerk to action. Cllr A Atkinson advised that together with Cllr Ferguson the legal questions submitted by Mr Cramer had been discussed and a revised list of questions had been agreed and circulated. Cllr Ferguson suggested that Mr Cramer provide the Council with feedback on the questions. Mr Cramer considered the questions and suggested the final draft should provide a context and be depersonalised. The Council agreed to this suggestion.
4. Cllr A Atkinson – To discuss the Platinum Jubilee Celebrations. Cllrs A Atkinson updated that 3 out of the 4 Committee members had requested to step down due to other commitments. Cllr A Atkinson proposed publicising the need for volunteers to organise the event. Cllrs voted unanimously in favour of this proposal.

64/21-22 Correspondence List

Previously circulated

65/21-22 Receipts received

| From whom | Amount (£) | Reason |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Barham Football Club | 500.00 | Hire of football pitch and pavilion. |
| Various | 155.00 | Hire of football pitch and pavilion. |
| Hirer A | 314.50 | Payment received in error. |
| Business Bank Instant | 25,000.00 | Bank transfer. |

66/21-22 Authorisation of the following items for payments was granted.

| PAYEE | Amount (£) | Reason |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|
| Bourne to Garden | 420.00 | Mowing of the recreation ground. |
| Jennifer Heap | 795.39 | Salary for October (Including payment of office allowance). |
| BVHMC | 314.50 | Refund on behalf of Hirer A. |
| Jacksons Fencing | 261.71 | Fencing materials for Green Court. |
| Hallmark | 116.93 | 12 x high-vis waistcoats. |
| Treasurers Account | 25,000.00 | Bank transfer. |
| A Cross | 160.00 | Pavilion cleaning. |
| CCC | 232.20 | BPC uncontested election charges. |

Points of Interest

1. Christmas trees will go up on Saturday 27th November and come down on Saturday 8th January. As the removal date is after Twelfth Night, residents will be asked to switch off the lights on 6th January.
2. Cllr Kirk announced the launch of the recycling center at the Church and thanked Rev. Estella.

The next meeting of Bridge Parish Council will be on Thursday, 9th December 2021 at 7.00p.m. in the Village Hall.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
8 NOVEMBER 1994
AGENDA ITEM

LH 1 per CA file Please

Bekesbourne
Patrisbourne
Bifrons Park
Bridge
Lanville farm
Bame Park
Highland Court
Bishopsburne
+ Charlton Park (arg)

7. PROPOSED NAILBOURNE CONSERVATION AREAS

INTRODUCTION

This report should be read in conjunction with the "Guidance Manual for the Designation of Conservation Areas" that was circulated to Members and adopted for use at the March 1994 Planning Committee.

A proposal to create a large conservation area within the Nailbourne Valley was first considered in 1990 (Minute No 146 1990/91 refers). Since that date further consultations have taken place both within my Department and also with Parish Councils and local amenity societies. Although the concept of a large conservation area was initially attractive it has the disadvantage that there could be a loss of identity for the individual villages and parklands which would make up such an area. I am now therefore recommending that the existing conservation areas be enlarged and that the three parks form separate but adjoining conservation areas. Charlton Park and Bishopsburne conservation areas would remain largely untouched with the exception of one small addition to Charlton Park and some minor rationalisation.

The old railway line running to the north of Bekesbourne forms a very strong physical boundary and the Nailbourne Valley to the north of this has been dealt with separately.

The Nailbourne Valley lies within the North Downs Dipslope. The Nailbourne Stream has cut through the Downs forming a sheltered valley which runs parallel to the Downs until it cuts through them between Bridge and Littlebourne. Dry valleys such as the Nailbourne generally have fertile loamy soils which could be easily worked and were good cereal growing areas. Neolithic and Bronze Age settlements favoured these areas.

Within the area under consideration there are at present five Conservation Areas; Bekesbourne Conservation Area was designated in 1973, Patrisbourne Conservation Area in 1971, Bridge in 1972, Bishopsburne in 1974 and Bishopsburne No 2 Conservation Area (which covers Charlton Park) in 1979.

Drawings showing each proposed Conservation Area are included in this report in the normal way. However I have also included (drawing no CV267) an overall plan which shows at a smaller scale all the existing and proposed Conservation Areas for this part of the Nailbourne Valley.

Members will note that I have not recommended designating the Conservation Area at Bifrons Park or to amend the present Conservation Area at Bridge at this time. This is because of the issues on housing and employment land that were raised during the Local Plan Consultation. As designation will have an impact on these issues, I consider it best to make the review of the areas part of the Local Plan process. I have however given an indication of the areas presently under consideration.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Since quite early times the natural attractions of the Nailbourne Valley have been recognised. The valley is rich in archaeological remains, many sites being known from cropmark evidence. The main concentration lies

within Bourne Park where there are twenty-four known sites of archaeological interest.

The Nailbourne Stream normally flows every few years and adds interest to this otherwise dry valley. At Bourne Park an artificial lake has been created which fills when the Nailbourne is in flood.

The Archbishop of Canterbury had a Palace in this attractive valley at Bekesbourne, built in 1552 by Archbishop Cranmer. Just to the south west the Marquess of Conyngham built Bifrons Mansion, since demolished. However, the village of Patricxbourne still looks like the "abode of the tenantry", the estate cottages and lodges having heavy bargeboards and other ornamentation commonly found in estate villages.

South of Bridge village, Bourne House was built in the early eighteenth century set in a fine landscaped park. Nearby Bridge Place is a fragment of a major mid-seventeenth century brick mansion, while on the high ground overlooking Bourne Park is another mansion, Highland Court, with an ambitious stone facade dating from 1904 with a fine model farm. To the north Renville is a good mid-nineteenth century house set in a miniature park.

The former Elham Valley Railway runs along the south west edge of the proposed conservation areas.

The natural beauty of this valley of the Nailbourne has been enhanced over the centuries both by the formation of the ornamental parks which form a setting for the large country mansions and also in a more modest way by the creation of gardens around the smaller country and village houses and cottages. Trees form a major element in the landscape. Some are planted formally within the parks and the villages, others have grown naturally in woods, shaves and hedgerows. All contribute to the special quality of this landscape which contains the greatest concentration of formal parkland within the City Council's boundaries.

The older parks are concentrated along the valley and are interspersed with settlements like a chain of beads along the string of the Nailbourne. The mansions are set part way up the slope with a view across the valley Stour and with the parks covering the full span of the valley, so that from within one sees little but parkland stretching up to the horizon with the settlements largely hidden by trees. The park at Highland Court and the small park at Renville are situated on higher ground.

Only a modest percentage of the area being put forward for designation is arable land, although the parks are now by and large used for agricultural purposes, mainly pasture. These pockets of farmland include orchards and a few acres of hop gardens, and all contribute to the setting of either the mansions or the village conservation areas.

Bourne Park is included in the Kent County Council Compendium of Historic Parks and Gardens as Grade II. Cobham Court, Bekesbourne is included as Grade IV and Charlton Park has recently been added at my suggestion.

CHARACTER OF PROPOSED CONSERVATION AREAS

By far the largest concentration of archaeological sites within the area under consideration lies along the south-facing slope of the Downs above Bourne House and Bishopsbourne area. These include many earthworks, enclosures, pits, ring ditches and trackways. Altogether there are well over fifty known archaeological sites within these proposed conservation areas.

Bekesbourne Conservation Area

The present conservation area is centred around the Old Palace, a house built by Robert Packham in the late 18th century (Grade II and a Scheduled Ancient Monument). Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1535-1554, built a palace here in 1552, which was enlarged by Archbishop Matthew Parker later in the 16th century. This was demolished during the Civil War and only the gatehouse remains which is now a cottage adjoining the house. (The gatehouse is Grade II). The Church of St Peter is Grade I and is built of flint with stone dressings. The nave and tower are 12th century, the chancel 13th century. The round-arched doorway is Norman with zig-zag mouldings. The transept dated 1715 has the south wall faced with mathematical tiles. The building was much restored in 1881-90. The churchyard contains some interesting 18th century skull, cherub, hourglass and spade headstones, chest tombs and oval bodystones. Cobham Court dates from the late medieval period and was a court house of the manor. Bekesbourne was a limb of the cinque ports and the Court of the Deputy Mayor of Hastings took place here in a large panelled room. Originally L-shaped of two storeys in red brick with tiled roof the earlier portion of the house was extended in the early 19th century. The brick bridge spanning the Nailbourne just south of the Church is dated 1776 and carries an inscription now indecipherable. The Old Vicarage in School Lane is dated 1729 but appears later in style. Of red brick with grey headers it has a doorcase with flinted pilasters. Parsonage Farmhouse is a 16th century or earlier timber-framed building.

I recommend that the present boundaries be extended to include more trees and landscape to the north, particularly the tree-covered railway embankment which forms a natural northern limit. The former small park to the Old Palace links Bekesbourne to Patricxbourne with the Nailbourne flowing along its eastern edge. This additional land forms part of the setting of Bekesbourne and should now be included within the new boundary. The Ickham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux Conservation Society has suggested that the former hop garden between Parsonage Farm and Station Road be added and I also consider that the fine oast and other buildings at Chalkpit Farm together with the adjoining trees be included.

Patricxbourne Conservation Area

The Patricxbourne Conservation Area is centred upon the village street. The Church of St Mary, a flint and caen stone building (Grade I), contains an especially fine Norman south door and a good Norman Priests door. The east wheel window is rare example and the tower with its ground floor forming a porch has a broached spire. The Old Vicarage (Grade II) is a 15th century timber-framed building with mid-late 19th century additions. An armorial plaque of the Marquess Conyngham is located over a side doorway in the garden wall. Waterfall Cottages and Bifrons Cottage are two of the cottages ornes dating from the 19th century estate of Bifrons, the Marquesses Conyngham's seat. Another prominent estate building is the ornate former oasthouse dated 1869 (Grade II).

Sondes House at the western end of the village is a red brick house with many 17th century features including a shaped Dutch gable and chimney stacks. In Station Road is a house dated 1707 but remodelled in the mid 19th Century with fretted bargeboards. Another unusual characteristic of this village is the number of buildings that are built of field flints, reflecting the local geology here.

The main Street is particularly attractive and many of the houses are set back behind brick walls. Although there are some modern properties these are not overpowering. The belt of woodland to the south forms an important backdrop to the village. Several of the properties which were

part of the estate village of Bifrons were altered in the cottage orne style in the mid 19th century and were given carved or fretted barge-boards, lean-to porches and other features.

Many important trees are at present outside the boundary and are unprotected by Tree Preservation Orders.

The small fields to the north of the village form a natural link to Bekesbourne and are part of the setting of Patrixbourne and I recommend that the boundary now be extended to include them thus linking the two conservation areas.

Bifrons Park Conservation Area

To the south of Patrixbourne lies Bifrons Park. The house has been demolished but the park still contains many fine trees. The Nailbourne runs through the park and the woodland along the ridge to the east is a very important landscape feature, which formerly marked the eastern edge of the park. Bifrons Park is now unfortunately divided by the A2 Bypass but both halves of the park are of considerable landscape value with many fine trees and forms an important part of the setting of the villages of Bridge and Patrixbourne.

Bridge Conservation Area

The present conservation area was designated in 1972 and contains most of the historic core of the village. A century ago Bridge was at the head of a union of local parishes. Out of a population of 857, 128 were officers and inmates of the workhouse known as "The Close" (listed Grade II). At the moment The Close is not within the conservation area but because of its historical and archaeological interest it should be included together with land and tree-belts which form an important part of the setting of the village. I also suggest that buildings in Brewery Lane and Patrixbourne Road and together with part of the course of the Nailbourne, be added.

The Renville Farm and Bridge Railway Station Conservation Area

The former Bridge Station on the old Elham Valley line would be included and I now recommend that we also take in the course of the railway line as far north as the A2 bypass road. This forms a natural link to Renville, a good 19th century house. The mid-nineteenth century three-kiln oast at Renville Farm was part of the Patrixbourne Estate development and in similar style to the oast in the village (Grade II). The land between Dover Road and the former railway forms the setting for this group of buildings.

Renville is set in a miniature park and is approached from Watling Street along an avenue. On either side are paddocks within which are more trees with further trees behind the house.

Renville House is not listed but is of considerable architectural interest. It is constructed of yellow bricks with a slate roof having a wide overhang supported on paired brackets. It dates from the mid C19.

Bourne Park Conservation Area

Bourne Park House, whose architect was possibly John Shaw the younger, is a larger house than existed at Bifrons. It has two storeys, built of brick with hipped roofs and is set most elegantly in the wide valley of the Nailbourne overlooking a small artificial lake. The present house was built by Elizabeth Aucher in the early 18th century on the site of an

older building erected by the Bourne family. The house is listed Grade I. The 18th century ice house and a bridge of 1847 spanning the Nailbourne are listed Grade II. The Nailbourne feeds the ornamental lake below the house and the extensive park stretches up to the skyline on both sides of the valley with many specimen trees, clumps and belts of woodland.

The approach from Bridge along the road to Bishopsbourne looks like a private drive, which it once was. It leads through a broad vista of open land that appeared in 17th century prints to be most impressive formal parkland. The trees by the road, the hanging woods and the cedars by the main drive to the house give an echo of the past. One of the best views across the park is from the top of Bridge Hill. The layout of the park is now informal with clumps and specimen trees throughout the meadowland.

Also included within the proposed conservation area is Bridge Place (listed Grade II*), the remaining wing of a large mansion built by Sir Arnold Braems in the early 17th century, the remainder having been demolished by John Taylor of Bifrons between 1704 and 1729.

Behind Bridge Place is the site of the brickfield which was very active during the nineteenth century, providing many of bricks for the local buildings.

The boundary would encompass Lenhall Farm, with an interesting oast dated 1912, and the old parkland tree belt running westwards up the slope. The natural boundary to the west is Redhill Wood and Warren Wood which form an important skyline feature. South of Lenhall Farm lies Crows Camp, a group of very attractive Victorian estate cottages set in a hollow with some fine trees. I recommend that these be included as they are an important part of the Bourne Park estate.

The natural continuation of this boundary is the tree-clad former railway embankment running northwards towards Canterbury. This would include Great Pett Farm, with a late 17th century Farmhouse (Grade II), a barn (Grade II) and a large oast complex set in well-treed grounds.

At the south-eastern end the new conservation area would abut the boundaries of the existing conservation areas of Bishopsbourne and Charlton Park.

To the north east of the Nailbourne Stream Bourne Park rises up to Watling Street, the Roman Road running along Barham Downs. This road is tree-lined for much of its course here and forms an important skyline feature.

In the late 18th and 19th century the Canterbury Race Course was situated between Bourne Park and Highland Park just north of the Watling Street. This became a golf course and has now been bisected by the new A2.

The area to the north of Bridge Hill (Watling Street) is somewhat more problematic and I had originally included it all as far as the new bypass. However the Bridge Parish Council suggested that the new housing estates here should be omitted and I have sympathy with this view. Although this area was formerly parkland surrounding Bridge Hill House and still contains many trees, the character of much of it has now changed substantially. I therefore suggest that we include both sides of the tree-lined Bridge Hill at this point together with the less spoiled parts of the former grounds to Bridge Hill House. The House itself dates from the late 18th century and is listed Grade II and the grounds contain many fine trees. The boundary at this point would also include the former tree-lined approach to Highland Court as far as the new bypass.

Highland Court Conservation Area

Highland Court was originally known as Higham Court. In 1904 Count Zabrowski, the racing motorist of Chitty-Chitty-Bang-Bang fame, created an ambitious stone mansion by encasing the eighteenth century core in a Palladium style exterior. This is Listed Grade II* and the contemporary forecourt walls are Listed Grade II. Highland Court Farm is a model farmstead dating from 1929 built by the owner of Highland Court to the highest standards. The buildings are of considerable architectural and sociological value and are constructed in red brick with clay tile roofs and louvred copper roof ventilators. Details are traditional with oak posts and braces to the open cart sheds. I have also taken in part of the Barham Downs outside the park boundary which includes part of the old racecourse, several small ornamental tree plantations and five archaeological sites.

Unfortunately to the south east of the house the Historic Park has lost much of its character due to the loss of Parkland trees and the planting of orchards and associated screen planting, although some tree belts, groups and other features still survive. At Highland Court Farm the numbers of fruit storage buildings have expanded over the years, and although these were initially fairly contained, the more recent development of very large units on the previously undeveloped farmland to the south east has created an alien intrusion on the immediate landscape. The recent appeal decision which allowed a further extension of this use is unfortunate, and given the convenient access of the A2 it is possible that there will be pressure for further extensions to this industrial development in the future. Members should take this into account when considering the proposed conservation area and should decide whether or not to resist further extensions. My view is that the present usage should be contained within the existing area and efforts concentrated on mitigating its present impact by tree and landscape screening. I consider it important to retain the rural setting of the model farm and to maintain its historic link with the house by including it in the proposed Conservation Area. The proposed boundary reflects this view and the designation will strengthen the Council's hand in resisting further erosion of the historic landscape. In the longer term I would seek opportunities to restore some of the lost parkland and landscape and enhance the setting of this important house and farm. In addition to the park I suggest inclusion of a sunken, tree-lined lane to the east as this is an important part of the setting of the model farm buildings.

Bishopsbourne Conservation Area

Bishopsbourne is a delightful village set in the quiet Nailbourne Valley. The Church of St Mary (Grade I) is a spacious 13th century building of knapped flint with tiled roof and a tower with a weathervane. Oswalds, next to the Church, (Grade II) was the home of Joseph Teador Konrad Korzeniowski, better known as Joseph Conrad.

Court House, west of the Church (Grade II) is a mid 15th century Wealden timber-framed house and the former Jacobean style school, now a house, is dated 1871.

The southern side of The Street is lined with very attractive cottages including Ivy Cottage, Forge Cottage, The Old Cottage, a 16th century timber framed house and the Post Office all listed Grade II. Bourne Cottages and the Grove area locally listed and the Mermaid Public House is a good 19th century building. Court Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II) has 18th century features but an earlier core.

The whole settlement is made especially attractive by the large number of trees which are such an important part of the setting.

There would be little change to this conservation area which would be surrounded on all sides by other areas, but some rationalisation is suggested, which involves taking Court Lodge Farm and the intervening land out of the present Bishopsbourne Conservation Area No 2 and adding it to the main Bishopsbourne Conservation Area.

The Charlton Park (Bishopsbourne) Conservation Area

Charlton Park (Grade II) was originally called Charlton Place. The house has an 18th century front but is an older building. George IV is said to have been a frequent visitor between 1795 and 1820. The approach from the end of Bishopsbourne village street follows an avenue of Chestnut, limes and elms. The Nailbourne flows through the middle of the park and the mansion is set on the slope close to the old railway line looking across the valley to Watling Street. Much damage was caused by the 1987 storm but the owner has carried out extensive replanting to replace the lost trees.

Although I have found no evidence to support the idea that Charlton Park might have stretched west of the railway link this could have been the case and I suggest that the boundary is adjusted to include a fine ornamental clump of trees south of Charlton Farm and to omit Court Lodge Farm as mentioned above. No other changes are proposed.

Prevalent and Traditional Building Materials

Throughout the area under consideration the main traditional building materials are red stock brick with some yellow stocks being used on 19th century buildings. Many buildings are now rendered including some of the earlier timber framed buildings. There are in addition some flint or flint and brick buildings especially at Patricxbourne. Roofs are predominantly covered with clay peg tiles with some slate.

The Protection of Trees

Many of the trees within the proposed Conservation Areas are already protected by Tree Preservation Orders including large areas of Bourne Park and Charlton Park. There are also a few isolated TPO's at Patricxbourne and Bridge, details will be available at the meeting. However, large numbers of the trees within the proposed boundaries are not at present protected. Members should refer to pages 18-20 of their guidance manual for further information on the protection of trees.

Planning Policies

The following policies are relevant to this proposed conservation area and seek to conserve the character of the built and natural environment. Further details on these policies is given in the Members Guidance Manual.

The Kent Structure Plan, 1990 (2nd Review) - S5, S6, RS1, RS2, BE3, BE4, CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC10, MWD1.

The Kent Structure Plan, Third Review (1993) - S1, S5, EK4, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV5, ENV6, ENV11, ENV14, ENV16, ENV17, ENV18, ENV19, ENV21, NR6, ED5, ED6, T01, T3, T15, T18, RS1, RS4, RS5, SR2, SR3.

The Deposit Draft Canterbury District Local Plan 1994 - D1 to D6, D8 to D13, D15 to D34, D36, D37, D47, R1, R2, R4, R5, R7 to R13, R15, R6, R19, R20, R22, R23, R25.

The proposed conservation areas and extensions to existing areas all lie within an Area of High Landscape Value (Policies D33 and RS) or within a Special Landscape Area or in an area proposed for inclusion in a Special Landscape Area (Policies D33 and R4).

The Kent Countryside Plan 1983 - see the Guidance Manual for information.

Members should ask themselves whether they believe the existing policies contained in the Kent Structure Plan and other relevant documents give sufficient recognition to the special architectural and historic interest of the proposed Conservation Areas and their historic landscape setting. In my view they recognise the general importance of wide areas of countryside and provide general policies which can be applied if proposals for new development occur, but they do not recognise the particular areas of architectural and historic interest and features which are special to these areas and to which The City Council should pay special attention in the exercise of its powers under the Planning Acts. It seems to me that one of the most practical and effective ways open to the City Council of implementing the intentions and policies set out above, is where appropriate, to designate conservation areas.

Consultations

The Parish Council of Bekesbourne-with-Patrixbourne say that they are aware of the pressures within this area and welcome the proposal.

The Bishopsbourne Parish Council unanimously approve the proposed area and strongly support the proposals. They recommend linking Charlton Park to Kingston and including Barham Downs, south of Highland Court.

The Nailbourne Protection Society say that they unreservedly support any proposal which will enhance the protection of this delightful valley and hope that the City Council will declare as much of the valley as possible a Conservation Area.

The Stour Valley Society say that they encourage any move to conserve the Kentish Countryside and in particular the river valleys. They support the proposals but hope that this will not be taken by the few responsible landowners to indicate that their stewardship is at fault.

The Bridge Parish Council, although fully supportive of the principle, have made several suggestions during the course of discussions.

However they feel strongly that the portion of Bifron's Park which lies between the village and the A2 bypass road should be omitted from the Conservation Area, at least for the time being.

The County Planning Officer points out that the proposed area is traversed by the North Downs Way. In general he is not in favour of incorporating existing Conservation Areas each of which is distinctive in its own right in one large area. He feels that the amalgamation of the existing areas by the inclusion of "unexceptional open spaces" will initially devalue their distinctive character.

The Head of Heritage Conservation, Kent County Council, says that the area is rich in archaeological remains. Many of the sites are known from cropmark evidence. There do not appear to be any sites of major

archaeological importance outside the proposed boundaries although there are crop-marks where features have been destroyed by agricultural activities.

The Ickham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux Conservation Society fully supports the idea of a new conservation area as its effect would be a continuation of the proposed extensions to Littlebourne Conservation Area. They say that the Nailbourne-Little Stour Valley is a distinguished and interesting landscape feature and this was acknowledged and utilised by the creators of the six country estate parklands, which start with Charlton and end with Lee Priory and could be said to include Broome, Denne Hill and Barham as well. Following a walk by a group of their Members they have made suggestions for three additional areas, all of which have subsequently been incorporated within the boundaries.

Mr R D Neame of Court House, Bishopbourne owns a good deal of land within the Bishopsbourne Conservation Area and has started a major replanting scheme in Bourne Park. He has written to say that he is very interested in conservation and is using the minimum of weedkillers and artificial fertilizers. He recently gave a piece of land to the Council which has lovely views over Bourne Park. He fully supports the main proposals and feels strongly that the old railway line should be included (which it is). This is a natural habitat for plants and varied wildlife. He does not feel that there is any advantage in including small areas to the west of the old railway line as he feels these are already covered by existing policies.

DISCUSSION

There has been widespread support for the majority of these proposals. This is an exceptional group of parklands and villages which is certainly unique in this part of Kent. I have been careful to include only those areas which were formerly within the park boundaries or which include open land, trees or woodland which form part of the setting of the proposed conservation areas.

Bridge Parish Council have asked for the review of Bridge and Bifrons Park to be deferred and considered as part of the Local Plan process. The Parish Council are proposing that the part of Bifrons Park between the A2 and the village be developed to provide housing, business units, a village hall and parking. The Parish Council also consider that this land is not visually or topographically part of Bifrons Park.

In my opinion the bypass whilst intrusive has not destroyed the original quality of the parkland. However, I agree that in view of the strong objections of Bridge Parish Council that there is merit in deferring the conservation area review for both Bifrons Park and Bridge. These areas under consideration are shown hatched on drawing CV267 which gives the overall picture of the Nailbourne Conservation Areas. The review of Bifrons Park and Bridge will therefore be finalised after the Local Plan process has considered the future of the land between Bridge and the A2.

As far as the Bishopsbourne Parish Council's comments are concerned, Members should note that Kingston Conservation Area is already linked to Charlton Park by means of the old railway line but the remainder of the intermediate land does not have significant special interest.

My response to the Stour Valley Society's comment would be to say that the area is being designated precisely because landowners have looked after the area so well in the past.

The County Planning Officer mentions the inclusion of unexceptional open spaces. The "unexceptional open spaces" however include several major and historic parks which were laid out as the setting of major country houses. Not only will designation give recognition to their historical and landscape importance but it will give valuable protection to many fine trees which are vital to the setting of the houses and in some cases the existing village conservation areas themselves. However, I agree that a series of separate conservation areas is more appropriate than one large area.

The map provided by the County Council indicates that by far the largest concentration of archaeological sites lies along the south-facing slope of the Downs above Bourne House and Bishopsbourne and within the proposed Bourne Park Conservation Area. There do not appear to be any sites of major archaeological importance outside the proposed boundaries although there are crop-marks where features have been destroyed by agricultural activities.

The areas mentioned by Mr Neame have been included either because they were within the original park boundaries, which predate the construction of the railway, or are important areas of woodland which form a skyline feature which is part of the setting of the proposed conservation areas.

EFFECTS OF DESIGNATION

When considering designating a Conservation Area Members must be aware of their statutory duties and the effects of designation and should refer to their guidance manual for further information.

CONCLUSION

The extension of the village conservation areas to include the setting of each settlement is in line with City Council established policies. Similarly the parks which form the landscaped setting of Bourne House, Highland Court and Renville clearly meet the criteria. In addition the parkland in many cases also forms part of the setting of the adjoining village.

These proposals are strongly supported by the parish councils and local amenity societies.

As I have explained there is a problem at Bridge and Bifrons Park and members must decide whether they intend to accept the Parish Council's suggestion to consider these as part of the Local Plan process.

In all cases only surrounding land, woodlands and tree belts which essentially contribute to the setting of historic settlements, buildings and parks are included within the suggested boundaries.

RECOMMENDATION

Conservation areas are defined as areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.

I consider that the areas shown on the attached Drawings Nos CV 260-266, should be designated as Conservation Areas to provide protection to their special character.

TO DISCUSS and if thought appropriate

TO RESOLVE -

- (a) That the areas shown on the appended drawings Nos CV 260-266 be designated under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as Conservation Areas, in view of their special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve and enhance, such areas to be known as "The Bekesbourne Conservation Area", "The Patricxbourne Conservation Area", "The Renville Farm and Bridge Railway Station (Bridge) Conservation Area", "The Highland Court (Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne) Conservation Area", "The Bourne Park (Bishopsbourne/Bridge) Conservation Area", "The Charlton Park (Bishopsbourne) Conservation Area", and "The Bishopsbourne Conservation Area".
- (b) That the Chief Executive and Town Clerk be authorised to take all steps necessary together with the giving and publishing of appropriate notices and registering of a local land charge, in connection with the designation of the Conservation Areas.

List of background papers (excluding published works) for this report:-

16.12.91 Letter from County Planning Officer, KCC
26.06.90 Letter from Stour Valley Society
12.12.90 Letter from Nailbourne Protection Society
22.01.91 Letter from the Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne
13.12.91 Letter from Littlebourne Parish Council
17.12.90 Letter from Bishopsbourne Parish Council
19.02.92 Letter from the County Archaeological Officer, KCC
17.12.91 Letter from the Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne
10.12.91 Letter from the Director of Highways and Transportation, KCC
10.12.91 Letter from the Head of Land and Property, KCC
27.12.91 Letter from the Ickham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux Conservation Society
16.12.91 Letter from Parish Council of Bridge
20.02.92 Letter from Bishopsbourne Parish Council
11.12.91 Letter from the Parish Council of Bridge
24.05.93 Letter from Mr R D Neame, Court House, Bishopsbourne
19.05.93 Letter from the Parish Council of Bridge
12.09.94 Letter from the Parish Council of Bridge



Victoria Asimaki [REDACTED]

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan - NE Response

Moore, Sophie [REDACTED]

21 June 2023 at 12:34

To: planning <planning@canterbury.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for your email requesting Natural England's consultation on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. Please find attached Natural England's response to this consultation.

Kind regards,

Sophie Moore

Lead Advisor - Sustainable Development
Sussex and Kent Team
Natural England

Pronouns: She/Her - [Why have I put this?](#)

Working Hours: Monday-Thursday 8am-6pm

www.gov.uk/naturalengland



This message has been sent using TLS 1.2

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.



Bridge Neighbourhood Plan NE Response.pdf

52K

Date: 21 June 2023
Our ref: 435247



Canterbury City Council
Military Road
Canterbury
CT1 1YW

Customer Services

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Ms Asimaki,

Planning consultation: Bridge Neighbourhood Plan- Regulation 16 Consultation
Location: Bridge

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 12 May 2021 which was received by Natural England on the same day.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2037

Policy C3- Nutrient Neutrality

As advised in our previous response (our ref. 406921), under the current national approach to Nutrient Neutrality, Natural England supports the proposed wording for Policy C3 which states that developments will only be supported if they can achieve nutrient neutrality with regard to the Stodmarsh sites. We also support the following Policy C3 wording '*new development at this site will not be supported unless it contains details of the measures that will be taken to ensure that polluted runoff (including suspended sediment) does not leave the site and enter the Nail Bourne and surrounding waterbodies during construction and operation.*'

Natural England has no further comments to make on this policy, or on any other policies proposed within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Habitat Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

Natural England previously gave advice on the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) in our response dated 01 November 2022 (our ref. 406921). Having reviewed the HRA submitted at Regulation 16 stage, we are pleased to see that our advice has been incorporated and that the updated nutrient guidance and calculator have been used to calculate the nitrogen and phosphorus loads resulting from the 40 dwellings allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. In utilising the updated guidance the nutrient budget calculations now take the post-2025 tightened permit limits at Newnham Valley Preston WwTW into consideration, resulting in a smaller phosphorus load to mitigate.

In addition, Natural England is pleased to see that the list of mitigation measures outlined in paragraph 5.43 has been updated to include links to The Wetland Hub and the Wetland Mitigation Framework to aid potential applicants. However, our advice remains that water efficiency measures and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be listed in this paragraph.

Final Comments

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Sophie Moore at [REDACTED]. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Sophie Moore
Lead Advisor- Sustainable Development Team



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

South East ePlanning [REDACTED]
To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

26 June 2023 at 10:14

Dear Sir or Madam

I attach Historic England's response to the above consultation.


Yours faithfully,

Alan Byrne BSc MSc IHBC

Historic Environment Planning Adviser

(Kent, East Sussex, West Sussex, Surrey)

Regions Group, London and South East Region



Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16 Consultation (HE response)-26.06.23.pdf
663K



Historic England

Planning Policy
Canterbury City Council
Council Offices, Military Road
Canterbury
Kent CT1 1YW

Our ref: PL00769562

Your ref:

Telephone

Email

Date

26 June 2023

[By email only to consultations@canterbury.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@canterbury.gov.uk)

Dear Sir / Madam

Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

Thank you for your email of 12 May 2023 consulting Historic England on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan.

The area covered by the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan to a large extent falls within the boundary of the Bridge, Bourne Park and Bifrons Park Conservation Areas. It also includes a number of important designated heritage assets including 43 Listed Buildings, including the Church of St Peter and Bridge Place (both listed at Grade II*); and a Scheduled Monument (the Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Hanging Hill). In line with National Planning Policy Framework it will be important that a positive strategy is included in the neighbourhood plan that conserves those elements which contribute to the significance of the historic environment and protects those heritage assets that contribute to its character so that they can be enjoyed by present and future residents of the area.

The Kent Historic Environment Record reveals that 101 records refer to historic sites or buildings within the Parish. Even if 44 of these are likely to replicate features on the national heritage list, 57 records relate to otherwise non-designated heritage assets. Notable among these are the course of the major Roman road Watling Street, one of the foremost highways of Roman Britain, which runs through the heart of the settlement of Bridge and is marked as a Roman road on the Ordnance Survey base map.

Bridging points on Roman roads frequently form minor foci of activity and as such it is likely that the settlement has a high potential for the presence of remains of Roman activity. Records of observation of surviving evidence of the Roman road surface and settlement activity are contained within the HER for a site at High Street, Bridge (Monument record number TR 15 SE 371), whilst a 4th century Romano-British burial site is recorded at Bridge Hill (HER monument number TR 15 SE 7). Aerial photography reveals the evidence of a complex settlement of late Prehistoric or Roman form just to the north west of Bridge at Station Road; depending on its state of preservation this is likely to be considered a site of at least regional importance. This site is likely to be highly sensitive to harm resulting from



Historic England, 4th Floor, The Atrium, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill, London EC4R 2YA
Telephone 020 7973 3700 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.





development but may also be currently affected by ongoing ploughing, which is likely to have a cumulative negative effect over the long term.

The HER also contains evidence of Bronze Age activity at Star Hill and Bishopsbourne within the Parish. Parts of the parkland of the 17th century estates of Bourne House and Bifrons lie within the south and east of the parish respectively and would be considered as non-designated heritage assets in their own right. The HER also contains records of a number of military features relating to the defence of Britain in the Second World War.

We have the following specific comments to make regarding the draft plan:

Policy C1 – we support this policy and note in particular the revisions to point c) and point d) to reflect our comments at Regulation 14 stage (by letter dated 13 April 2018 to the Parish Clerk); in our view the policy now meets the requirements of the NPPF.

Policy C2 – The site is within a conservation area and adjacent another and the impact of building 47 housing units and leisure and community facilities on their character and appearance, and the significance of the heritage assets within them, should be carefully assessed. The setting of the village core on rising land and its association with the open fields around it, including in the area of the proposed housing site, is a key characteristic of the historical form and landscape character of the village and should be respected in any development taking place in this location.

Important views across the site should be taken account of in any development proposal. In view of the potential impacts development of this site may have on heritage assets, the setting of the village and the landscape context of the site, including its position within the Kent Downs AONB. There should be a clear justification for the allocation of this site for a mixed-use development; for example, as a rural exception site as defined in the Canterbury City Plan, and that it provides public benefits that outweigh any harm to the significance of heritage assets.

A more detailed analysis of the potential impacts of the development of the site, that you may find helpful, is set out in our letter to the Council dated 7 September 2018 in response to the previous Regulation 16 consultation.

These points should be addressed in a revised policy; as it stands we cannot support the policy on the basis that it fails to fully recognise the potential heritage impacts of the development of site, nor does it set an appropriate framework for development of the site that reflects the sensitivities of the heritage assets and wider historic landscape character of the village.



Policy F1 – we support the policy, but perhaps add reference to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as well as the Village Design statement to strengthen the context for the policy.

Policy F2 – while we note the intention of this policy to protect undesignated archaeological assets, but the policy wording is inconsistent with both the NPPF and Canterbury Local Plan policy and should be revised to make it compliant with these. In or view, the policy may be omitted entirely in view of the applicability of the relevant provision of Canterbury Local Plan Policy DS26.13.

These comments are based on the information provided by you at this time and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan and which may, in our view, have adverse effects on the historic environment.

Yours sincerely

Alan Byrne

Historic Environment Planning Adviser



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

NH/23/01000-Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16)

Nigel De Wit

26 June 2023 at 15:41

To: "consultations@canterbury.gov.uk" <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| For the attention of: | Victoria Asimaki, Canterbury City Council |
| Consultation: | Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16) |
| National Highways' Ref: | NH/23/01000, #20019 |

Dear Ms Asimaki,

Thank you for your formal notification email of 12 May 2023 inviting National Highways (NH) to comment on the **Bridge Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2037: Regulation 16 consultation**, seeking a response by no later than 5pm on Monday 26 June 2023.

Having reviewed the Plan, our response to the consultation is **No Objection**.

We are satisfied that if implemented the policies and proposal (47 residential units, Policy C2) would not have an unacceptable impact on the safety, reliability, and/or operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in the vicinity of the parish (A2).

Thank you for consulting National Highways. If you have any questions or queries regarding our response, please contact us at planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk.

Kind regards,

Nigel De Wit MRTPI, Assistant Spatial Planner

South East Region, Operations Directorate

National Highways

For information about our engagement with the planning system please visit
<https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/planning-and-the-strategic-road-network-in-england/>

From: [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** CCC Consultations
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2023 10:53 AM
Subject: # 20019 Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

Good morning,

I am writing to notify you that Canterbury City Council has formally received Bridge Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan and we are publicising it in line with **Regulation 16** of *The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012*.

All the relevant documents are available at <https://news.canterbury.gov.uk/consultations/bridge-neighbourhood-plan/> where you can find our Privacy Policy and information on what happens after this consultation period.

You can give us your views by completing the online questionnaire [here](#). You are also welcome to send any written representations to this email address (consultations@canterbury.gov.uk).

The draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents are available to view at **St Peter's Church, Bridge** between **9am and 5pm** each day while this consultation is live.

You have until **5pm** on **Monday 26 June** to give us your views, any representations must be received before the closing date.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Victoria Asimaki

Principal Policy Officer (Engagement)

Canterbury City Council

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other

use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | <https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, [1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ](#)

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.



CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

26.06.2023 KCC Response to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

26 June 2023 at 16:37

To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

[Redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached the Kent County Council submission in respect of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation.

If you have any queries, please let me know.

Kind regards,

Alessandra

Alessandra Sartori

[Redacted]

2 attachments



26.06.2023 KCC Response to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation.pdf
227K



Appendix A 29.04.22 KCC Response to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation.pdf
266K



Canterbury City Council
Council Offices
Military Road
Canterbury
CT1 1YW

Growth and Communities

Invicta House
County Hall
Maidstone
Kent
ME14 1XX

Phone: [REDACTED]
Ask for: Alessandra Sartori
Email: [REDACTED]

BY EMAIL ONLY

26 June 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Bridge Neighbourhood Plan (2022-2037) Regulation 16 Consultation

Thank you for consulting Kent County Council (the County Council) on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The County Council has reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and for ease of reference, has provided comments structured under the chapter headings and policies used within the document.

Objective A – Building a Strong, Competitive Economy & Ensuring the Vitality of the Village Centre

Policy A1

Highways and Transportation: The County Council, as Local Highway Authority, supports this policy, particularly the provision of vehicle and cycle parking for new business units within the built-up area boundary of the village. The County Council is pleased to note the associated text in paragraph 2.2 which clarifies that this should accord with the standards set out in the Canterbury Local Plan and by the County Council. The intentions of Objective A to support employment opportunities, small-scale business development, and effective internet networks are also welcomed.

Objective B – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Highways and Transportation: The County Council is supportive of this objective as it generally aligns with the County Council's [Local Transport Plan 4](#) and [Active Travel Strategy](#), and promotes the provision of a cycle route between Bridge and Canterbury. It is anticipated that much of this route will be delivered by the development proposals at Land North and South of New Dover Road (Mountfield Park, South Canterbury, Planning Application Reference: CA/16/00600), and that other opportunities to expand the local cycle network will be explored through further development coming forward.

The Neighbourhood Plan mentions car parking problems and congestion in the village; it also suggests seeking to increase the amount of parking spaces in the High Street. As Local Highway Authority, the County Council considers that this may be at odds with the aim of reducing congestion, as referenced in paragraph 2.5, with further on-street parking likely to reduce the ability to maintain free flow traffic. Paragraph 3.7 discusses the shortage of available parking and compelling employers to encourage staff to use alternative parking, which supports Objective A rather than Objective B. The Neighbourhood Plan could consider the introduction of limited waiting within the on-street parking lengths to help manage this.

Policy B1

Highways and Transportation: The County Council supports this policy as it promotes sustainable transport in new developments through the local cycle network and pedestrian routes.

Policy B2

Highways and Transportation: This policy is in alignment with Canterbury City Council and the County Council parking standards, and is therefore welcomed.

Objective C – To Maintain a Choice of High-Quality Homes with Good Design

Policy C1

Highways and Transportation: The County Council is supportive of this policy, particularly paragraph (b) which describes careful consideration of the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape). This will ensure quality design and placemaking in new developments.

Policy C2

Highways and Transportation: The County Council notes that the appendices were not initially available at the time the Neighbourhood Plan was submitted, although they have since been made available online. The principles outlined in this policy are supported by the County Council, however, the drawings provided in Appendix E should be taken as an indicative layout only, as it is appreciated that detail will be subject to planning approval. It is noted that the drawing shows the housing development gated to restrict public access. This

would prevent the development from being adopted by the Local Highway Authority and will require a turning head to be provided within the adoptable highway limits. The County Council would therefore recommend that the development is not gated.

The abbreviation for 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' has been defined in paragraph 4.21, however, this has not been provided in the Glossary at the end of the document. The County Council would therefore recommend that this is included to provide clarity to all those reading the document.

Policy C3

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS): The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, is supportive of Policy C3 but would note that it is only partially published. The last section of content within the text box cannot be viewed in its entirety and the Neighbourhood Planning Committee is advised to address this.

Objective D - Promoting Healthy Communities

Public Rights of Way (PRoW): As a general statement, the County Council is keen to ensure that its interests are represented within the local policy frameworks of the parishes/towns in Kent. The County Council is committed to working in partnership with the Neighbourhood Planning Committee to achieve the aims contained within the [KCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan](#) (ROWIP).

It is disappointing that the Neighbourhood Plan makes little reference to the PRoW network and no reference to the KCC ROWIP, further to the County Council's previous response to the Regulation 14 consultation. The Neighbourhood Planning Committee is strongly advised to ensure that reference to the ROWIP is included to enable successful joint partnership working to continue, which can support the delivery of improvements to the PRoW network. The County Council would also draw attention to the ROWIP key themes 'Evolution of the network' - EN04, 'Rights with responsibilities' - RR01 and 'Efficient delivery' - ED02. Joint delivery of the strategic plan will ensure significant benefits, as well as potential access to funding opportunities ('Efficient delivery' - ED07).

A recent example of such funding opportunities is the Highland Court Farm Chapel Down expansion (Planning Application Reference: CA/22/02055) – the County Council has secured Section 106 funding for PRoW network improvements to the extensive Bridleway network of the area which will result in improved off road walking, cycling and equestrian routes for both active travel and leisure purposes. The connections to and from Bridge and the industrial area as well as towards Bokesbourne station will be improved. These works will complement on-site improvements to be completed by the developer during construction.

Funding through developer contributions for off-site network improvements has also been secured through the development at Land North and South of New Dover Road (Mountfield Park, South Canterbury, Planning Application Reference: CA/16/00600) for routes into Canterbury, with a new bridleway being created for active travel and leisure use.

The County Council would encourage that reference is made to the PRoW network in Objective D to ensure that opportunities through development can be maximised for PRoW.

The County Council would recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a PRoW Definitive Map, which is available upon request¹.

Objective E - Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change and Flooding and Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

SuDS: The County Council acknowledges the intention of Objective E to minimise vulnerability and provide resilience, and the subsequent statement made in paragraph 6.5 regarding the Neighbourhood Plan area: *“The risk identified is so great that no development will be supported in Flood Zone 3.”* The Neighbourhood Planning Committee may wish to consider this with regard to the requirements of the Exception and Sequential Tests as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, which (subject to passing these tests) permits development in Flood Zone 3. The County Council would therefore advise that the wording of this policy is amended for consistency with national planning policy.

Objective F - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Heritage Conservation: In respect of paragraph 7.1, the text understates the historic character of Bridge parish. The [Kent Historic Environment Record](#) lists more than 130 known heritage sites, buildings and discoveries in the parish. These include 43 listed buildings (not 63, as stated) of which two are Grade II* and 41 Grade II. There are also at least thirteen Locally Listed Buildings that do not have statutory protection, but which have been identified by Canterbury City Council as having a particular significance and contribute to local character. These include medieval buildings such as St Peter’s Church, the Red Lion, White Horse and domestic buildings on the High Street together with a larger number of post-medieval buildings and an oast house. Together, these buildings give Bridge a particularly historic character as reflected in the Conservation Areas that cover about half the parish.

In respect of paragraph 7.5, in addition to its built heritage, Bridge has a very significant archaeological heritage dating from prehistory to the 20th century.

Although there is some potential for Palaeolithic archaeology in the parish, the most striking prehistoric features are likely to be found in the extensive cropmarks that can be seen from aerial photography alongside the road, to both north and south of the village. In the north, these include a set of trackways and enclosures found along Station Road. These are mostly undated but many will be of prehistoric origin. Among these features was found a late iron age helmet that had been used as a cremation vessel.

As the text rightly notes, the main archaeological feature in Bridge is the Canterbury to Dover Roman road, Watling Street, that passes along the High Street through the middle of the village. Archaeological remains associated with the use of the road may lie alongside, and to

¹ prow@kent.gov.uk

the south of the village. Bourne Park, though not covered by the Neighbourhood Plan, contains numerous cropmarks associated with Bourne Park Roman villa and some of these extend into the Neighbourhood Plan area. The most significant archaeological site in the Neighbourhood Plan area is the Scheduled Monument of the Saxon Barrow Cemetery at Hanging Hill. In 1771, there were estimated to be more than 100 barrows on Hanging Hill. Most have now been ploughed away but archaeological remains will still survive within the Scheduled area and probably outside it too. To the east of Bridge Hill, between the road and the A2, cropmarks associated with Second World War practice trenches and perhaps earlier features can also still be seen. These should all be recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The final feature of note in the Neighbourhood Plan area is the dismantled railway that passes through the west of the Parish.

This rich and diverse heritage has the potential to enhance life in Bridge for the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan in a number of ways. It is not clear whether the Conservation Areas in Bridge are supported by Conservation Area Appraisals. If not, then the community could help with this process by gathering information about the historic structures and layout of the Conservation Areas. This would also provide an opportunity to review the extent of the Conservation Areas and identify ways in which their character can be enhanced. The dismantled railway could be used as a community resource for walking trails and to provide views of the landscape. This would allow this heritage asset to contribute to the health and well-being of local people. The archaeological heritage of the Neighbourhood Plan area lends itself to a range of community activities such as study groups, trails and interpretation. This would help put the village in its historic and landscape context and therefore help integrate any new development into its surroundings more effectively. This could include a [Historic Landscape Characterisation](#) of the Parish which would help identify surviving historic features such as hedgerows, assarts, field boundaries, tracks and lanes.

Historic England has produced [guidance](#) for communities developing Neighbourhood Plans and the County Council would advise that this is taken into consideration by the Neighbourhood Planning Committee to help assess the usefulness of various tools that have proved valuable to those developing Neighbourhood Plans. In particular:

- Historic characterisation - this helps provide a general context for the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan, provide evidence for more detailed landscape, environment and heritage policies, and provide a means to evaluate potential development sites/locations in Bridge.
- Conservation Area Appraisals - a Conservation Area Appraisal is an objective analysis of the elements which together define the area's special architectural or historic interest.
- Design Policies for local areas - design policies can provide robust design principles for applicants and decision makers to guide proposals in each area. Matters covered include the suitability of particular materials, set-back of buildings from road frontages, boundary treatments and the desired scale and form of new buildings. Similar requirements can be set out for individual site allocations.
- Identification of local heritage assets - plan developers can focus on local heritage assets and identify certain buildings, boundary walls and other structures as being

worthy of protection as non-designated heritage assets due to the important contribution that they make to the distinctive local character of the parish. Canterbury City Council has a Local List of heritage assets, and it would be advisable to take advantage of this.

Policy F1

Heritage Conservation: The County Council notes that successful development is sympathetic to both the character and the heritage of the area in which it is built. In addition to complying with the Village Design Statement, the policy could require that new development enhances the character and heritage of Bridge, and that existing historic tracks and lanes should be respected where possible to help the new development work with the historic grain of the existing buildings and landscape.

Projects allied to the Policies contained within this Neighbourhood Plan

Projects B1 to B5

Highways and Transportation: The County Council supports the projects listed, which aim to promote safe and sustainable transport, and improve air quality.

Additional Comments

Highways and Transportation: The County Council notes that the document makes reference to the adopted [Canterbury Local Plan](#) (2017-2031), and quotes the policies within that to be cross-referenced to those proposed in this Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst the document also acknowledges that Canterbury City Council will be updating the Local Plan in due course, it may be appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to acknowledge this and give weight to the emerging Local Plan.

As previously mentioned, Appendices A to F were not initially available to view at the time that the Neighbourhood Plan was submitted. It has not been possible, therefore, to fully cross reference the information purported to be contained within these appendices.


Minerals and Waste: The County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, recognises that reference has not been made to the safeguarded land-won minerals (River Terrace Deposits, Sub-Alluvial River Terrace Deposits and Brickearth) in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Therefore, the County Council's previous comments made in respect of the Regulation 14 consultation remain applicable (Appendix A).

The County Council notes that allocated development sites are only exempt from mineral safeguarding considerations if this has been successfully addressed in the formulation of the adopted Canterbury Local Plan. As no sites are considered to be exempt, a Mineral Safeguarding Assessment is required for the relevant development sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area that are coincident with safeguarded minerals. This is a policy

requirement of the adopted Development Plan for the area, including the adopted [Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan](#) 2013-2030.

KCC would welcome continued engagement as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses. If you require any further information or clarification on any matters raised above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Stephanie Holt-Castle
Director for Growth and Communities

Encs:

Appendix A: 29.04.22 KCC Response to Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation



Growth and Communities

Jennifer Heap
Clerk, Bridge Parish Council
12 Bridge Down
Bridge
Canterbury
Kent CT4 5AZ

Invicta House
County Hall
Maidstone
Kent
ME14 1XX

Phone: [REDACTED]
Ask for: Alessandra Sartori
Email: [REDACTED]

BY EMAIL ONLY

29 April 2022

Dear Jennifer Heap,

Re: Bridge Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation

Thank you for consulting Kent County Council (KCC) on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The County Council has reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and for ease of reference, has provided comments structured under the chapter headings and policies used within the document.

Objectives

Objective A. Building a Strong, Competitive Economy & Ensuring the Vitality of the Village Centre

Policy A1

Culture and Creative Economy: Alongside the consideration of the provision of vehicle parking and cycle parking for new business uses within Bridge, the County Council would also recommend consideration of the accessibility of new business uses by public transport to ensure sustainable connectivity of these sites for employees.

Objective B. Promoting Sustainable Transport

Policies B1 and B2

Highways and Transportation: The County Council, as Local Highway Authority, is supportive of Policies B1 and B2, along with the intentions of Objective B, which generally accord with the County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 ([LTP4](#)) and [Active Travel Strategy](#). KCC will

continue to work on the facilitation of a dedicated cycle route between Bridge and Canterbury through development opportunities at Mountfield Park and any other opportunities that may arise.

It is also recognised that Bridge Parish Council are actively engaged with KCC officers through the Highway Improvement Plan (HIP) process with regards to investigations about a 20mph speed limit within the village.

Objective C. To Maintain a Choice of High-Quality Homes with Good Design

County Council Community and Infrastructure Services: The County Council, as key infrastructure and service provider, would welcome further engagement with Bridge Parish Council to discuss infrastructure requirements as any new development comes forward.

Culture and Creative Economy: In relation to paragraph 4.18, KCC would also welcome exploration as to how the new village hall could also be designed to accommodate creative and cultural activity.

Policy C3

Culture and Creative Economy: At Great Pett Farm, KCC recommends there could also be the exploration of the conversion of farm buildings for appropriate employment use, as well as residential housing.

Objective D. Promoting Healthy Communities

Culture and Creative Economy: Alongside the provision of leisure and community facilities to serve the village, the County Council also recommends the provision of facilities that can accommodate creative and cultural activity, which can address social isolation and loneliness; anti-social behaviour by providing alternative activity; creative activity for young people and promote social cohesion. This would also support [Canterbury Local Plan](#) policies QL1 and QL3, contributing to quality of life. This could include a broad range of activity including touring theatre, craft classes, community choirs, knitting groups and should complement, without duplicating, the offer in Canterbury.

Policy D1

Public Rights of Way (PRoW): The County Council welcomes future engagement with the Parish Council to ensure that their interests are represented within the local planning policy frameworks. Whilst the County Council recognises that the maintenance of public footpaths is largely supported in paragraph 5.8, KCC is concerned that little further reference is made to the PRoW network. KCC would welcome future engagement with the Parish Council to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan makes that reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). KCC is committed to working in partnership with the Parish Council to achieve the aims contained within the ROWIP and seeks successful joint partnership working to continue to support the delivery of improvements to the PRoW network. KCC would also draw attention to the ROWIP key themes 'Evolution of the network' - EN04, 'Rights with responsibilities' - RR01 and 'Efficient delivery' - ED02. Joint delivery of the strategic plan will

ensure significant benefits, as well as potential access to funding opportunities ('Efficient delivery' - ED07).

In respect of PRoW and access to green space, the County Council requests that the Neighbourhood Plan emphasises the importance of new developments providing sustainable connectivity to services, facilities and public transport. The importance of that new provision integrating with the existing PRoW network, and supporting the improvement of the existing network, must also be emphasised within this policy.

Development must deliver public realm that is safe, secure and of high amenity, encouraging the public to walk, cycle and spend time outside, which all deliver positive health and wellbeing outcomes. The County Council would recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan incorporates the need to involve KCC's Rights of Way and Access Service in the delivery of Active Travel opportunities.

Consideration should also be had for the quality of the environment which is equally as important as the construction of Active Travel routes.

Objective E. Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change and Flooding and Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Policy E1

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS): The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, welcomes the inclusion of the flood risk policy and reference to SuDS within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Biodiversity: The County Council would request that further consideration is given to biodiversity within the Neighbourhood Plan, specifically to enhancements to open space and promoting the inclusion of ecological enhancements within new developments.

Objective F. Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Heritage Conservation: The County Council notes that paragraph 7.1 in the Neighbourhood Plan does not fully take account of the historic character of Bridge parish. The Kent Historic Environment Record lists more than 130 known heritage sites, buildings and discoveries in the parish. These include 43 listed buildings (not 63 as stated) of which 2 are Grade II* and 41 Grade II. There are also at least 13 Locally Listed Buildings that do not have statutory protection, but which have been identified by Canterbury City Council as having a particular significance, and that contribute to local character. These include medieval buildings such as St Peter's Church, the Red Lion, White Horse and domestic buildings on the High Street together with a larger number of post-medieval buildings and an oast house. Together these buildings give Bridge a particularly historic character as reflected in the Conservation Areas that cover about half the parish.

Policy F1

Heritage Conservation: It should be noted that successful development is that which is sympathetic to both the character and the heritage of the area in which it is built. In addition to complying with the Village Design Statement, the policy should require that new development enhances the character and heritage of Bridge. Existing historic tracks and lanes should be respected, where possible, to help new development integrate within the historic grain of the existing buildings and landscape.

Paragraph 7.5

In addition to its built heritage, KCC notes that Bridge has a very significant archaeological heritage dating from prehistoric to the 20th century. Although there is some potential for Palaeolithic archaeology in the parish, the most striking prehistoric features are likely to be found in the extensive cropmarks that can be seen from aerial photography across Bridge. Alongside the road, to both north and south of the village, lie extensive archaeological remains. In the north, these include a set of trackways and enclosures found along Station Road. These are mostly undated, but many will be of prehistoric origin.

As the text rightly notes, the main archaeological feature in Bridge is the Canterbury to Dover Roman road, Watling Street, that passes along the High Street through the middle of the village. Archaeological remains associated with the use of the road may lie alongside and to the south of the village, Bourne Park. Although it is not covered by the Neighbourhood Plan, this park contains numerous cropmarks associated with Bourne Park Roman villa and some of these extend into the Neighbourhood Plan area. The most significant archaeological site in the Plan area is the Scheduled Monument of the Saxon Barrow Cemetery at Hanging Hill. In 1771, there were estimated to be more than 100 barrows on Hanging Hill. Most have now been ploughed away, but archaeological remains will still survive within the Scheduled area and likely outside it too. To the east of Bridge Hill, between the road and the A2, cropmarks associated with Second World War practice trenches and perhaps earlier features can also still be seen.

The final feature of note in the Neighbourhood Plan area is the dismantled railway that passes through the west of the Parish.

Moreover, this rich and diverse heritage has the potential to enhance life in Bridge for the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan in a number of ways. The County Council would request that clarification is provided regarding whether the Conservation Areas in Bridge are supported by Conservation Area Appraisals. If they are not, the community could help with this process by gathering information about the historic structures and layout of the Conservation Areas. This would also provide an opportunity to review the extent of the Conservation Areas and identify ways in which their character can be enhanced. KCC also recommends that the dismantled railway could be used as a community resource for walking trails and to provide views of the landscape. This would allow this heritage asset to contribute to the health and well-being of local people. The archaeological heritage of the Neighbourhood Plan area does also lend itself to a range of community activities - such as study groups, trails and interpretation. This would help to recognise the historic and landscape context of the village and thereby help integrate any new development into its

surroundings more effectively. This could include a historic landscape characterisation of the Parish which would help identify surviving historic features such as hedgerows, assarts, field boundaries, tracks and lanes.

Historic England has produced [guidance](#) for communities developing Neighbourhood Plans. Consideration of this guidance would help to assess the usefulness of various tools that have proved valuable to those developing Neighbourhood Plans. In particular, historic characterisation, Conservation Area Appraisals, design policies for local areas and the identification of local heritage assets.

Projects allied to the Policies contained within this Neighbourhood Plan

Objective A

Project A1

Culture and Creative Economy: KCC recommends that consideration could also be had for a physical hub, which could provide essential services (flexible desk space, access to technology and equipment), and a place for workers to meet and collaborate to support freelancers and homeworkers.

Project A2

Culture and Creative Economy: To support the presence of the Post Office within the village, the potential to co-locate with other services or businesses could be explored.

Objective D

Project D1


Culture and Creative Economy: The County Council would also recommend that cultural facilities are also maintained to serve the village.

Canterbury District Local Plan 2017 Policies

Chapter 2 – Housing

Minerals and Waste: The County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, can confirm that the Neighbourhood Plan does not have within it, nor is it within, 250 metres of any safeguarded mineral facility or waste facility. Therefore, the Neighbourhood Plan does not need to be considered against any of the minerals and waste safeguarding exemption provisions of Policy DM 8: Safeguarding Minerals Management, Transportation, Production and Waste Management Facilities of the adopted [Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30](#).

However, the Neighbourhood Plan area is within an area where mineral deposits are identified as safeguarded and form part of a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA). KCC would draw attention to the MSA Proposals Map for the Canterbury City Council area below:



- River Terrace Deposits
- Sub - Alluvial River Terrace Deposits
- Brickearth (Other Areas) - Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway

KCC notes that the Neighbourhood Plan proposes further development in alignment with the policies and allocations in Chapter 2 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017. Therefore, it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan makes reference to the requirement for a Mineral Assessment (MA) for any planning applications that are submitted on any of the allocations of the adopted Local Plan in the Neighbourhood Plan area. This is necessary where MAs have not been completed during the allocation's formulation in the 2017 Local Plan for the Canterbury City Council area.

KCC would welcome continued engagement as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses. If you require any further information or clarification on any matters raised above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Stephanie Holt-Castle
Director for Growth and Communities



Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan: CCC Representations

Andrew Thompson

12 July 2023 at 10:17

To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Hi,

Please find attached representations from CCC as LPA on the Regulation 16 Bridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Kind regards

Andrew

--

Andrew Thompson

Corporate Policy and Strategy Manager

Canterbury City Council, Military Road, Canterbury, CT1 1YW



 **CCC Response to Bridge NP Reg 16_ July 2023 (3).pdf**
86K

Sent via email only to consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

12 July 2023

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan: Reg. 16 (Submission) Consultation

The City Council as Local Planning Authority (LPA) wishes to congratulate Bridge Parish Council on reaching the Reg. 16 (Submission) stage in the preparation of its neighbourhood development plan (NDP). The LPA wishes to acknowledge the efforts made by the qualifying body (Bridge Parish Council) and the volunteers from within the wider Bridge community to get the plan to this important stage on the journey to completion.

It is clear that a lot of hard work has gone into the plan, and it covers a range of topics that are of interest and importance to the community of Bridge. These topics include economy, sustainable transport, high quality homes and good design, healthy communities, climate change and the historic environment. The LPA considers this range of topics to be both appropriate and necessary for the settlement of Bridge and its surrounding area. The plan appears to be covering the right topics as it seeks to shape and influence development in Bridge over the coming years.

The LPA also wishes to applaud Bridge Parish Council for taking the opportunities presented by both the Localism Act (2011) and the subsequent Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012 and subsequent revisions) to determine the future of housing delivery within the parish. By seeking to allocate land through its NDP, the qualifying body is acting on behalf of the wider Bridge community to take on the challenge of identifying and selecting the most appropriate site for a form of development that will deliver the best outcomes for the parish, now and into the future.

Not all qualifying bodies wish to take on such an important or complex task but by doing so, Bridge Parish Council has given greater purpose and significance to its NDP. The inclusion of housing allocation can have a galvanizing effect come the referendum, and those eligible to vote on the final version of the plan may have a greater incentive to do so. This is good for the democratic accountability that the referendum offers and for raising the profile of the NDP within Bridge. While the LPA wishes to applaud the qualifying body for taking on this task, it has certain observations to make around the sections of the plan that address this matter. These observations are set out in this consultation response and deal with site selection process, the use of SEA and LVIA and how Policy C2 is presented within the plan.

Site Selection Process, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) & Landscape Matters

Policy C2 seeks to allocate land at Bridge Fields for 47 new homes, a new village hall, associated access roads and the transfer of ownership of sports and recreational facilities. On reviewing the submission package of materials, the LPA notes that a site selection process was undertaken to determine the most suitable location for this allocation.

This site selection process is described in the SEA report prepared by AECOM consultants and is dated July 2020. The LPA expects the SEA report to reflect a robust and appropriate process and that the conclusions it reaches have been used to inform Policy C2 in the correct manner. However, the LPA defers to the examiner to confirm that this is the case, and that the correct SEA and site selection processes have been followed, in line with the neighbourhood planning regulations.

We take this opportunity to highlight an inconsistency between paragraph 4.23 in the SEA report that describes a maximum of 40 homes for land in Policy C2 and Appendix E of the NDP that describes the same land as being suitable for 47 homes. We would ask that the examiner reviews this inconsistency and recommends the appropriate way forward to resolve the situation.

The LPA also notes that a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been prepared to by consultants ETLA. This report is dated December 2021. It is understood that this report has also been used to inform the choice of site allocation. As with the SEA work, the LPA defers to the examiner to confirm that due process has been followed, in line with best practice with regard to the preparation and use of LVIA's and the neighbourhood planning regulations.

Presentation of Policy C2

The LPA has concerns over the way this policy is presented in the plan, with the illustrative materials that identify the allocated land only contained in an appendix (Appendix E) rather than being in the main body of the plan. The LPA would wish to see a simple "red line" plan that uses an OS base map to clearly identifies the extent of land that is subject to the provisions of Policy C2.

This red line plan should be accompanied by an illustrative diagram that indicates which parts of the red line area are best placed to accommodate the different components of Policy C2. These components include the new homes, the village hall, car parking and access infrastructure, access arrangements and the land that will accommodate the sports and

recreation facilities. As with this red line plan, this illustrative diagram should be contained with the body of the NDP.

When introduced as a pair of supporting drawings, the material current in Appendix E (labelled as Woodchurch Properties and OSG Architecture) can be deleted from the NDP package of materials. The LPA believes this is a more appropriate way to present the land allocation sought by Policy C2.

One section of the text of Policy C2 sets out a requirement for a transfer of land from private to public ownership. While this transfer may be deemed necessary to implement Policy C2, the mechanism for doing so should lie outside the planning policy statement. The primary purpose of a planning policy for a site allocation is to inform the determination of a subsequent planning application for the land in question. It is important to note that planning policies do not directly determine land ownership rights. Land ownership is primarily governed by property law in England & Wales, and planning policies operate within that legal framework. Planning policies can influence how land is used, but ownership rights and transfers of land are generally determined by property law and contractual agreements, not planning documents such as an NDP.

Policy E4 – Local Green Space Designation

The LPA notes that the NDP seeks to protect from development a series of green spaces and these are identified on a map featured on page 25 of the NDP. While this map is accompanied by a table on page 26, that contains written descriptions of each space, the LPA is concerned that the evidence base and justification for each spaces' inclusion in the policy is not robust enough.

Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

The LPA considers all spaces referenced in the Bridge NDP to be in reasonably close proximity to the community but the special nature of each site (e.g. beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, or richness of its wildlife) has not been demonstrated in the NDP nor in any additional report or appendix. The table on page 26

could be updated to include a column that sets out which of the tests of local significance each space meets. This would go some way to assist with this demonstration of importance.

One further test of local green space designation is that sites should not be an extensive tract of land. Site 1 (Church Meadow), Site 2 (Land between Brickfields and the Nailbourne) and Site 3 (Water Meadows along Brewery Lane/Nailbourne) all appear to be large relative to the built areas of Bridge village. We therefore ask the examiner to assess if these particular spaces meet the criteria as set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF.

Similarly, we would draw the examiner's attention to Policy E3 and request that the suitability of the wording be considered as part of the examination process..

Public Engagement & Consultation

The LPA is aware that previous iterations of the Bridge NDP did not proceed to referendum on the advice of an examiner due to deficiencies in the public engagement process used to inform the plan. The LPA notes in the current submission package the Consultation Statement, that sets out the work undertaken in this field. It appears from reading this statement, that reasonable efforts were made to engage and inform the wider Bridge community about the NDP project and opportunities for them to contribute were made available.

However, the LPA defers to the examiner to confirm that the public consultation process used by the qualifying body is in line with the neighbourhood planning regulations.

Conclusion

The LPA is pleased to support Bridge Parish Council as the NDP enters the examination phase. It will be on hand to answer any questions that the examiner may have at this point. If considered suitable to move forward to referendum (subject to any modifications, as appropriate) then the LPA expects the Bridge NDP to make a valuable contribution to Canterbury City Council's Local Development Framework over the coming years.



Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

KSLPlanning [REDACTED]

12 July 2023 at 12:21

To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Dear Team,

We always recommend an objective is included to protect and enhance the environment. Indicators should relate to the environmental constraints in your local area. This may include flood risk, water quality, biodiversity.

Together with Natural England, English Heritage and the 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. (copy attached). There is a useful check list in this document.

We also recommend your plan takes account of relevant Thanet District Council policies, plans and strategies including TDC's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, flood risk strategies (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies>), and the South East River Basin Management Plan (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan>).

We hope this information is useful. Please don't hesitate to contact us if you need any further information.

Yours sincerely,

-Adam

Adam Blake

Planning Advisor, Sustainable Places, Kent, South London and East Sussex

Environment Agency | Orchard House, Endeavour Park, Addington, West Malling, Kent, ME19 5SH



**Friends of the
LGBT+ Network**

Does Your Proposal Have Environmental Issues or Opportunities? **Speak To Us Early!**

If you're planning a new development, we want to work with you to make the process as smooth as possible. We offer a bespoke advice service where you will be assigned a project manager who be a single point of contact for you at the EA. This early engagement can significantly reduce uncertainty and delays to your project. More information can be found on our website [here](#).

Please note – Our hourly charge is now £100 per hour plus VAT from 1st April 2018.

[Quoted text hidden]

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.



Neighbourhood Plan Advice Note Feb 2021.pdf

315K

Kent, South London and East Sussex

Neighbourhood Plan Advice Note

Updated: February 2021

Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to deliver multi-functional benefits through linking development with enhancements to the environment. This document sets out the key environmental issues, within our remit, which should be considered.

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>

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 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies>), and the South East River Basin Management Plan (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan/>) Thames River Basin Management Plan (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289937/geth0910bswa-e-e.pdf) as appropriate.

The information below explains the key issues we would consider in reviewing your Plan. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment.

Flood risk

Development must be safe and should not increase the risk of flooding.

Neighbourhood Plans should conform to national and local policies on flood risk:

If a Neighbourhood Plan is proposing sites for development please check whether there are any areas of Flood Zones 2 or 3 within the proposed site allocations.

You can view a site's flood zone on the Flood Map for Planning on our website: <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

If the proposed allocation is located within Flood Zone 2 or 3 you should consult the Flood Risk and Coastal Change pages of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG): <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/>

Here you can determine whether the flood risk vulnerability of the proposed development and the flood zone are compatible. In accordance with national planning policy the Sequential Test should be undertaken to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. This should be informed by the Environment Agency's floodmap for planning and the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), if they have one. We recommend you contact the Local Planning Authority to discuss this requirement further.

We would have concerns if development is allocated in this high risk flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.

It is important that your Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with these sites can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward.

We can provide any flooding information which we have available – such as predicted flood levels and historical flood data. Please note that there may be a charge for this information. Please contact our Customers and Engagement Team at ksle@environment-agency.gov.uk for further details.

In addition to the above you should also check with the Local Planning Authority's Neighbourhood Planning team with regards to other sources of flooding (such as surface water, groundwater, sewers and historic flooding) as detailed in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), now has responsibility for local flood risk management and may hold flooding information that is not identified on our Flood Map.

Climate Change Allowances

The Local Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should indicate the extent of flood zones with likely climate change.

On 19 February 2016, we published new guidance for planners and developers on how to use climate change allowances: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>.

Flood Defences

Areas of your Neighbourhood Plan area, or proposed sites, may be given protection by a flood defence/alleviation scheme. Where this is the case the Plan should acknowledge this and identify the level of protection provided (including any climate change allowance). It should be noted that flood defences are intended to protect existing properties and are not to facilitate new development in areas that would otherwise be impacted by flooding. Any assessment of development behind flood defences should consider the impacts of a breach or overtopping. Where it is determined that new development should be behind a flood defence financial contributions may be sought to maintain or improve the structure.

Thames Estuary 2100 (Tidal Defences)

In line with requirements set out in the Thames Estuary 2100 ([TE2100](#)) plan, developments in this location will need to demonstrate how the flood defence could be raised in the future to meet the demands of climate change.

No activities on site should preclude access to the flood defence from maintenance or prevent the future raising of flood defences. In some cases we hold technical drawings of flood defence structures which may be of use. To request these you should contact our Customers and Engagement Team at ksle@environment-agency.gov.uk

Ecology

Proximity to watercourse/ Ecology

Main rivers can be viewed on the Environment Agency's map:

<https://environment.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=17cd53dfc524433980cc333726a56386>

We normally require a buffer zone of 8 metres (fluvial) and 16 metres (tidal) between any new development and the top of the bank of the main river. The permanent retention of a continuous unobstructed area is an essential requirement for emergency access to the river for repairs to the bank and for future maintenance and/or improvement works. A buffer between new development and the river wall is also required to ensure no adverse loading which could impact the stability of the channel wall. This buffer zone will help provide more space for flood waters, provide improved habitat for local biodiversity and allows access for any maintenance requirements.

Where development is proposed next to the river we recommend that it includes a green buffer strip alongside the watercourse. Where such a buffer strip does not currently exist, we normally seek that it is established. This is a key way in which we carry out our legal duty to further and promote the ecological and landscape value of rivers and land associated with them. In urban areas, in particular, rivers have

often been degraded by past development, and we expect that any new development should go some way to redress the balance.

The provision of green infrastructure, particularly along rivers, and the inclusion of sustainable drainage techniques can help reduce the risk of flooding. This can also provide recreational and wildlife benefits. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in the Plan will be encouraged. In accordance with national policy, any development proposal should avoid significant harm to biodiversity and seek to protect and enhance it; delivering biodiversity net gain. We would not support development proposals if there was shown to be a likely detrimental impact on the water environment.

Water Management and Groundwater Protection

Local level actions and decision making can help secure improvements to the water environment. This is widely known as the catchment-based approach and has been adopted to deliver requirements under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). It seeks to:

- deliver positive and sustained outcomes for the water environment by promoting a better understanding of the environment at a local level; and
- encourage local collaboration and more transparent decision-making when both planning and delivering activities to improve the water environment.

Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to deliver multi-functional benefits through linking development with enhancements to the water environment. Local WFD catchment data can be obtained from: <http://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/>

Overall deterioration in water quality and promoting improvement in the ecological status of any water body. Actions to achieve this are listed in the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) and the South East River Basin Management Plan <https://www.gov.uk/search?q=River+Basin+Management+Plans>

Where appropriate, a WFD Assessment (<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/water-supply-wastewater-and-water-quality/water-supply-wastewater-and-water-quality-considerations-for-planning-applications/>) should assess any potential impacts on the watercourse and demonstrate that the required enhancements will be delivered. Any development that has the potential to cause deterioration in classification under WFD or that precludes the recommended actions from being delivered in the future is likely to be considered unacceptable to us.

Groundwater Quality

Development must not cause pollution to the water environment.

Aquifers and Source Protection Zones

Some of your local area, and specific potential site allocations, may be located upon or within aquifers and Source Protection Zones (link below). SPZ 1 is especially sensitive. You might consider these within your Plan and when allocating sites. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be seen with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

To see if a proposed development is located within a Source Protection Zone, please use our online map: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/groundwater-source-protection-zones-spzs>

Land Contamination

You must consider land contamination when preparing your plan. Managing it during development is key to addressing past contamination and preventing further impacts during development.

You can establish if a site may be contaminated in several ways. Your Local Authority may hold a register of sites it knows to be contaminated. A list of potentially contaminated sites can be accessed on the following link:

<https://www.clare.co.uk/useful-government-legislation-and-guidance-by-country/76-key-documents/198-doe-industry-profiles>

We recommend you contact your Local Authority's Environmental Health team who may hold records on known/potential land contamination. Please note our primary concern is with regards to water quality. Your Local Authority's Environmental Health team will advise you on issues related to human health.

Further information can be accessed on the following links:

Guiding principles for the Land Contamination

<https://www.clare.co.uk/useful-government-legislation-and-guidance-by-country/192-guiding-principles-for-land-contamination-gplc>

Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328160926/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/scho0804bibr-e-e.pdf>

Approach to Groundwater Protection:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/692989/Environment-Agency-approach-to-groundwater-protection.pdf

Water supply and foul drainage

When allocating sites in you Plan, you will need to consider if the water supply and foul drainage infrastructure can accommodate the development. Your local water company can provide further information about water supply and sewerage capacity.

Surface water drainage

The inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) should always be a consideration within any development to reduce the risk of surface water flooding on and off site. The Lead Local Flood Authority, is the main contact for SUDS issues. However, we have interest in SUDS from a groundwater protection perspective and those area of critical drainage.

The collection and dispersal of clean surface water to ground to recharge aquifer units and prevent localised drainage or surface systems flooding in heavy rainfall is encouraged. However, dispersal into the ground through soakaways or other infiltration systems requires a site-specific investigation and risk assessment. Generally, we would accept roof drainage going to soakaway (or other systems), but other surface drainage may need to go through treatment systems or to foul main, for instance vehicle parking. Infiltrating water has the potential to cause mobilisation of contaminants present in shallow soil/made ground which could ultimately cause pollution of underlying groundwater resources. Where contamination is known or suspected, remedial or other mitigating measures will likely be required so that it can be demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to Controlled Waters.

We advise applicants to follow our guidance – Groundwater Protection. This is a report that highlights the importance of groundwater and encourages industry and other organisations to act responsibly and improve their practices. This can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>

The design of the drainage systems should be in line with G1, G9, G12 and G13 position statements: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>

Infrastructure Delivery

We would recommend that environmental infrastructure, including habitat enhancements, water storage areas, and green space, is taken into account if the Plan looks to fund local infrastructure.

Environmental Permitting Regulations

To see if a proposed development requires an Environmental Permit under the Environment Permitting Regulations please refer to our website:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/check-if-you-need-an-environmental-permit>

Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, a flood risk activity permit (FRAP) may be required for work:

- in, over or under a main river;
- within 8m of the bank of a main river, or 16m if it is a tidal main river;
- within 8m of any flood defence structure or culvert on a main river, or 16m on a tidal main river.

Flood risk activities can be classified as: exclusions, exemptions, standard rules or bespoke. These are associated with the level of risk the proposed works may pose to people, property and the environment. Local Authorities should advise developers to refer to the [flood risk activity permit section](#) of gov.uk for further information.

Please note

This document is a response to a Neighbourhood Plan consultation and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning application made in relation to any site.

You should seek your own expert advice in relation to technical matters relevant to any planning application before submission.

If you have any questions please contact the Kent and South London Sustainable Places team:

kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk



Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan consultation

14 July 2023 at 10:14

To: CCC Consultations <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>
[Redacted]

FAO : Victoria Asimaki

Dear Victoria,

Further to your email of 20th June, I now attach my representations on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation.

Please can you confirm receipt of my email and representations?

Kind regards.

Mike Goddard
[Redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]



Bridge NP Report FINAL 14.07.23.pdf
1385K

Comments on Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 16 Consultation

By Mike Goddard BA DipTP DMS MRTPI

July 2023

Introduction

1. I wish to make representations against the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Bridge.
2. I am a Chartered Town Planner. I moved to Bridge in 1987. I was a principal planner at Canterbury City Council from 1986 to 1988. I entered private practice and represented the city council from 1988 until 2009 on a wide range of planning matters including development briefs, planning applications and planning appeals. I was a part-time planning inspector for the government between 1997 and 2000. I am a director of Goddard Planning.
3. My key concern is the inclusion within the NP of substantial built development proposals for the recreation ground and the adjoining fields. In summary, the claimed reasons within the NP for including a proposed allocation for a scheme of 47 houses, an 84 space car park and village hall, together with access roads and other associated development cannot be substantiated. I consider that this major development is neither justified nor necessary. A closer examination of the proposal demonstrates that the scheme is in serious conflict with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Development Plan and the emerging replacement Plan.
4. My comments begin by considering the NP and the reasons stated within it why a NP is necessary.

The Neighbourhood Plan Document

Page 4 of NP – the vision for the village of Bridge

5. The *raison d'être* for the Neighbourhood Plan is stated as "the village was likely to have a sizeable housing development imposed upon it by Canterbury City Council, via its Local Development Plans, as well as similar proposals by other land owners and developers, without the village having a significant voice in determining its own future development." It goes on to state that the NP is seen as a mechanism by which local residents might address the challenges faced by the village of Bridge.
6. The council has issued its draft Local Plan which will eventually evolve, following consultation and examination, into an adopted Local Plan to replace the 2017 version. Whilst several sites have been put forward by developers in the council's Call For Sites, the council has not included

any sizeable housing development for Bridge in its draft Local Plan. These proposals (SLAA 217) were rejected by Canterbury City Council as not suitable. Draft Policy R5 refers to a Neighbourhood Plan housing requirement of 75 dwellings for the 25 year period between 2020 and 2045, amounting to no more than three dwellings per year. That quantum of housing could be achieved by infill development and redevelopment and possibly by small scale development adjacent to the built confines. The fear of sizeable development which resulted in the genesis of the NP has therefore not materialised. It is ironic in fact, that it is the parish council itself which seeks to impose upon this community a sizeable housing development of 47 units together with an 84 space car park and site for a new village hall.

7. On the same page the parish council states that it has consulted widely and frequently. However, we dispute that; and others who have made representations provide evidence to support that claim. The consultation period on this Neighbourhood Plan Reg 16, - from 27th June 2023 until 17th July 2023 - provides only 20 days to respond. We also dispute the claim in the NP that it has been shaped by consultations and we question the extent to which the points and views of people who have made representations have been taken into account in its preparation. There has been scant consultation with residents; if there have been any, they have not been well publicised.

Paragraph 4.7

8. The actual supply of housing as described in paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 is as a result of the development of windfall sites including infill development. The number of homes which will arise from this source will obviously diminish in the future as opportunities within the built confines dry up. These are opportunistic windfall sites and inevitably, there will be a demand for these homes. But the extrapolation of these past housing delivery figures is not a sound basis to plan for future housing development.
9. Not all settlements within the rural areas are equal. There are some settlements, such as Bridge where there are very limited opportunities for development because of the location within an AONB, because of the constraints of its heritage assets including the two conservation areas and the large number of listed buildings, plus substantial areas liable to flood risk. Due to these constraints, Bridge cannot simply be compared with other large less constrained settlements.

10. The rate of house building over past years should not be taken as a basis for planning additional homes within the village as a continuation of that level. Inevitably, these opportunities to build within the built confines will dry up to a small trickle. To make provision for future housing on this basis will therefore inevitably require development beyond the built confines. This will be in conflict with policies and objectives which seek to protect the AONB and the village's heritage assets.
11. This flawed basis for future planning of housing within the village will result in proposals which will likely cause unacceptable harm to the natural beauty of the AONB and will fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of listed buildings.

Paragraph 4.11

12. The NP at paragraph 4.11 takes the previous census material and population growth, extrapolates that into the future and translates that into a demand for new housing. There is no justifiable basis for this approach to future population growth. Any growth needs to be tempered by other considerations including the very real planning constraints of a village such as Bridge.

Paragraph 4.13

13. There is no evidence for this imposition of 168 housing units. Furthermore, the 2022 draft Local Plan allocates only 13 homes at Great Pett Farm under draft Policy R6.
14. Paragraph 4.14 reflects the NPPF's clear statement that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest.
15. These significant constraints are set out in paragraph 4.14. However, paragraph 4.15 merely provides a bland description of the location of the proposed development site and no assessment of its impact upon the AONB and conservation areas.
16. The reasoning for the allocation is set out in paragraph 4.16. This is based upon securing the recreation ground in perpetuity for the village. There is no threat to the future retention of the recreation ground as is explained very fully by Nick Cramer in his representations. There is no

likelihood of those recreation uses not continuing and this important village green space continuing to be available for the community.

Paragraph 4.23

17. The three alternative sites chosen and described in 4.23 of the NP all have very clearly identifiable constraints which the PC must have been aware of and which therefore appear to be chosen simply as unrealistic options which highlight the recreation ground as the only viable option. This is disingenuous of the parish council.
18. Church Meadow was previously rejected for housing development primarily because of flood risk. Conyngham Lane is located within the strategic gap between Canterbury and Bridge. Brickfields was previously rejected by the CDLP 2017 inspector because of its impact on the AONB.
19. A map of important local green spaces is found on page 25 of the NP. Area 6 is the recreation ground which has been artificially shortened. I consider that this notation should be extended north westwards up to the boundary with the school to reflect the historic, current and future boundaries and use as a recreation ground.
20. I would recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan be modified to also include as local green space the fields between the recreation ground and the A2 bypass as an important local green space and covered by a policy similar to that contained within the current CDLP Policy OS1 or Policy OS9.
21. The council seeks to promote sustainable travel. Project B4 states "To work with Canterbury City Council and others towards providing a safe cycle path between Bridge and Canterbury." But there are no policies or plans to achieve this very important facility which would significantly reduce travel to and from Bridge and Canterbury by private car.
22. The NP refers to a new village hall, but there is no reasoned justification why a new village hall in Policy C2 is necessary. Indeed, a substantial village hall would likely be used as a venue for weddings, parties, discos, dances etc, largely frequented by people living outside the village. That undermines the objective of sustainability and would result in unnecessary travel by private car and potential adverse impacts on the living conditions of nearby residents as a result of additional traffic and noise and disturbance particularly late in the evening when residents can reasonably expect quiet conditions. This would also lead to a

significant change to local people's living conditions. Where their existing surroundings are a quiet rural recreation ground, they would face significant urbanisation.

23. The NP appears to be prepared with the sole purpose of facilitating the allocation of housing and other development proposals on the recreation ground. I question whether the NP is actually necessary as its policies and objectives have not been supported by any clear steps to achieve them or they are duplicated and covered elsewhere within the NPPF and the adopted and emerging replacement Local Plan.

Basic Conditions Statement

24. This is a very thin document which in my opinion does not go far enough to demonstrate that the NP is in conformity with the NPPF and with the adopted Local Plan. It does not consider the NPPF and it merely lists policies in the NP which it considers are consistent with policies in the CDLP. But there is no explanatory text.

Major proposals for 47 houses, plus village hall, 84 space car park and access roads – planning considerations

25. In this section I consider the planning issues raised by these major proposals which were recently rejected in the city council's Call for Sites exercise.
26. The proposed allocation in the NP involves a housing scheme of 47 homes with 12 affordable units, plus a site for a new village hall and a total of 84 car parking spaces (54 for the village hall and 30 for the school in two separate car parks). Access for the school car park and village hall would be via Conyngham Lane. Access to the proposed housing would be from Patricxbourne Road by the creation of a new access with bridge over the Nailbourne to the east of the health centre. The justification for this proposal is set out within the NP. However, the reasons stated within the NP are flawed as I have explained in the previous section.
27. These substantial proposals have evolved over time. Various iterations of those proposals have been considered during the preparation, assessment and adoption of several Local Plans. They have been repeatedly rejected, including in the council's most recent Call For Sites.
28. The Canterbury District Local Plan 2017 (CDLP) sets out the strategic approach to the location of development in Policy SP4 and supports the

provision of new housing that is of a size, design, scale, character and location appropriate to the character and built form of the Rural Service Centres which includes Bridge. This is provided that such proposals are not in conflict with other Local Plan policies relating to transport, environmental and flood zone protection and design and those of the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan.

29. That strategic approach is reflected in the emerging draft Local Plan under draft Policies SS3 and R2 which provide further control limiting such development to within the built confines/settlement boundaries of the village unless in exceptional circumstances, for example where allocated in an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan.
30. Chapter 11 of the current Local Plan provides some protection for the areas I am referring to. Policy LB1 of the CDLP provides protection of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with priority given to the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty. Major development (which the Cantley proposals are) and which conflict with the objective to conserve and enhance the AONB will not be permitted except in exceptional circumstances where it is demonstrated to be in the public interest, the need is demonstrated and any detrimental effect is moderated or mitigated. I will deal with the issue of need later but beforehand briefly consider the impact of the proposals upon the protected AONB landscape and upon the setting of the village and its conservation area.
31. The draft Local Plan includes a diagram of Bridge on page 132 followed by the specific draft Policy R5. The key diagram draws the settlement boundary to include the village recreation ground which is shown both as an "existing community and/or sports facilities" and "open space/landscape buffer with a further notation "opportunities for green corridors" extending along the southern edge of the recreation ground and extending to the north east and south west.
32. If need is demonstrated, CDLP Policy LB1 requires it to be shown that other sites have been considered to meet that need which might have a less harmful impact upon the AONB. My concern is that need has not been demonstrated; but even if one concludes that it is demonstrated, there has been no thorough identification or evaluation of all other potential sites within the village which might meet that need and which might have a less harmful impact upon the AONB, conservation areas, the village recreation ground and other planning impacts. But rather, these proposals are driven by the mistaken view that unless they are

agreed, the village will lose its recreation ground. This is not sufficient grounds to support a Neighbourhood Plan.

33. The proposed major development involves land which is well beyond the built confines of the village. The site is widely visible from a number of public footpaths, bridleways and roads and dwellings. The proposals will transform both the recreation ground and the adjacent field from attractive tranquil and rural open areas to areas of substantial built development, access roads and surface car parking. There will be a significant adverse impact not only upon the AONB landscape but also upon the setting of the village and its conservation area. The recreation ground is the jewel in the crown at the centre of the village. It will in effect, be destroyed by these proposals.
34. The impact is not limited to the areas proposed for built development. The proposed access to the 47 residential units from Patricxbourne Road will be in a part of that road which is narrow and has a rural character and appearance. Inevitably, mature trees on the southern boundary of that field, on the northern edge of the road, which provide for a sylvan setting will need to be removed to provide visibility splays for the road to be widened and for a bridge over the watercourse. A rural lane will be suburbanised and the impact upon the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and the AONB landscape will be significant and harmful.
35. The character of Patricxbourne Road changes significantly to the east of the entrance to the Bridge Health Centre. The lane is tightly enclosed on the northern side, adjacent to the proposed entrance to the site, by mature trees which contribute significantly to the rural character of the lane, to the conservation area and in providing an attractive entrance to and departure point from this part of the village. The access is relatively close to the point at which the speed limit on this highway changes from the national speed limit – 60mph - to 30mph. Vehicles travelling along this section are very often exceeding the 30mph speed limit as they leave the national speed limit area. And similarly when leaving the village drivers often accelerate above the 30mph. Consequently, there would be a need for substantial visibility splays in both directions, greater than those which would normally be required within a 30mph speed limit and appropriate to the prevailing vehicle speeds. This will inevitably necessitate the removal of a substantial number of the mature trees. In addition, there would be the need for other highways related paraphernalia including, the widening of the road, the provision of a pedestrian footway, additional lighting, kerb stones and signage. And because of the need to traverse the

Nailbourne and to avoid the area which is subject to flooding, there would be a requirement for a substantial elevated road bridge which will add further to built development in this location. No details of this access road have been provided. This is a significant omission. The visual impact will be substantial. It will transform, in a very harmful way, the character and appearance of this part of the lane, the AONB, the conservation area and the setting of the village.

36. The proposals incorporate an access road from the entrance on Patrixbourne Road across what is now an open field. This will be the main vehicular and pedestrian access for the 47 houses proposed. It is very likely that street lighting will be required in addition to separate provision for pedestrians and cyclists. This will further suburbanise and transform this part of the field and village and cause unacceptable harm to the AONB landscape and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
37. The NP is supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA). The LVIA at paragraph 4.15 confirms that fieldwork was undertaken during summer months and that visibility at the site will increase in winter. The document was prepared in 2021. There has been ample opportunity to undertake the winter fieldwork which is recommended by the consultants in that same paragraph.
38. In considering landscape effects, the LVIA recognises that the landscape effect at the site level would be major adverse.
39. Paragraph 12.10 refers to the proposed development as forming a logical infill to the settlement pattern and one where development is clearly bound and physically contained by the A2 and Patrixbourne Road. I take a very different view. There will be no such enclosure. The development would be seen as a substantial extension of built development beyond the village confines into the AONB landscape and the parkland landscape of the Bifrons Park Conservation Area. It is not a logical infill to the settlement pattern. I disagree with the conclusion in relation to the impact on Bridge itself that the impact would be "minor adverse."
40. I also challenge the conclusions in relation to the impact upon Bifrons Park Conservation Area and Bridge Conservation Area. There is no assessment of the impact of the proposed access from Patrixbourne Road to the site across an open field used mainly for sheep grazing. The access would transform this narrow country lane with its mature trees adjacent to the Nailbourne. The construction of the new access would

require the removal of mature trees and vegetation and would involve the construction of a bridge across the Nailbourne. This and the necessary visibility splays, kerbing, footways, signage, lighting and other road paraphernalia would transform it from a rural lane in a way that would be seriously harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.



Photo 1 : Patrixbourne Road from a position to the west of the access to the Health Centre showing the change to a narrow, tree-lined lane. The proposed access to the housing development would be just beyond the access to the health centre, resulting in substantial removal of trees and the urbanisation of this attractive rural lane.

41. The impact upon the users of the recreation ground and the public right of way which traverses it is assessed in paragraphs 12.38 to 12.44. This is a visual assessment. The transformation from a tranquil space and informal recreation ground, where the predominant activity is casual recreation and not formal sports pitches, together with the substantial built development would have a significant and harmful impact.
42. The assessment of the impact of the proposals upon cyclists and motorists, and presumably walkers, on Patrixbourne Road is also flawed. In the absence of any detailed drawings of the proposed access to the development from Patrixbourne Road, the authors have concentrated solely upon the impact of the proposed development some distance beyond and not on the very significant changes which would result from the creation of an access to Patrixbourne Road. This sylvan lane leading

from the edge of residential development on the south side and the medical surgery on the north side is very much part of the rural landscape which extends beyond in an easterly direction. It is also an important part of the arrival of those travelling along Patrixbourne Road in a westerly direction into the village.

43. Viewpoint 9 gives a clear illustration of the sylvan and rural character of this part of the lane when looking in a westerly direction. My Photo 1 illustrates the view when looking east and shows the built up character of Patrixbourne Road up to the access to the health centre with the narrow tree lined lane beyond. This vista will be transformed with the access proposals associated with the proposed allocation.
44. The LVIA relies upon a total of 17 photographic viewpoints. However, it is notable that there is no photograph taken of the proposed point of access to the site to the north east of the health centre. That access point is shown in photo 2 below.



Photo 2 : Taken from bridleway looking north towards the major allocation, with Patrixbourne Road and the point of access to the site. The new housing would occupy the straw coloured field just to the south of the line of trees in the distance. This vista would be transformed as a result of the removal of trees, the bridge over the Nailbourne, the access road and the built development beyond.

45. The well used public bridleway climbs up from Patrixbourne Road in a southerly direction. The site can be seen for much of the length of that

bridleway. Yet the LVIA includes only one viewpoint (7) and no winter views. Photos 3 to 5 below were taken in winter between viewpoint 7 and Patricxbourne Road along that bridleway.



Photo 3 : Views from the bridleway with the site proposed for development clearly visible. The health centre can be seen in the middle of the photograph. Mature trees will be removed for the access. The access road would traverse the green field leading to the major housing development beyond.



Photo 4 : Views a little further to the west along the bridleway with the trees which would need to be felled to make way for the access clearly visible and the site beyond.



Photo 5 : Views from the northern part of the bridleway close to its junction with Patrixbourne Road looking towards the proposed access to the site.

46. It is also notable that there is no photograph taken of the recreation ground from the small car park and bridge over the Nailbourne which leads from Patrixbourne Road to the recreation ground.



Photo 6 : View from Patrixbourne Road to the recreation ground with the tennis courts to the left and the children's play area to the right.

47. We are also concerned that there are no computer generated images and no winter views which would provide an effective basis for an assessment of visual and landscape impact.
48. Photos 2 to 5 were taken in winter from the bridleway to the south of Patricbourne Road and demonstrate the visual exposure of the site and its contribution not only to the AONB but also to the setting of the village.
49. The assessors have wrongly considered the proposals to represent infill development and have consequently come to erroneous conclusions about both the landscape and visual impact of the proposal.
50. I challenge the assessment in paragraph 12.24. Paragraph 12.24 considers that the proposed development is "consolidated to Bridge and within the boundaries of the A2 and Patricbourne Road, such that the proposed development would retain the stated characteristics of a concentrated settlement pattern". In my opinion, the proposals would represent a major extension of the village beyond its built confines into the AONB landscape and parkland of the Bifrons Park Conservation Area. We disagree that the effect of the proposal is assessed as neutral.
51. The assessment wrongly concludes that the impact upon the East Kent Downs is assessed as none and the effect is assessed as neutral. These landscape impacts appear to be based upon the authors' /prior assessment that the site is contained by the A2 and Patricbourne Road, a comment which is made repeatedly within the document and leads to the conclusion, for example in paragraph 12.27, that any perception of the proposed development would be in the context of existing residential and recreational land uses. I, together with the Kent Downs AONB Unit take a very different view.
52. In considering the impact upon the Bifrons Park etc Conservation Area, the LVIA does not recognise the comments made in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) that the site is within the historic parkland of the conservation area and contributes to the open aspect of this part of the conservation area and that development would impact upon the fabric and setting of the conservation area. A key impact would be through the loss of the open aspect and perspective of this part of the conservation area. This adverse impact is expressed more fully in paragraphs 5.28 to 5.34 of the SEA.
53. It is also notable that the appraisal in the SEA was based upon a development of a maximum of 40 homes, a new village hall, sports pitches, recreational play areas and undeveloped land for recreational

use. That scheme was significantly smaller than the one which has been carried forward in the NP. The SEA has therefore not been based upon the latest proposal.

54. Furthermore, the document appears to rely upon policies within the NP which have a strong focus on protecting and enhancing landscape character, the quality of the public realm and local distinctiveness. The document argues that this will help limit potential impacts of new development on the Kent Downs AONB. Yet the NP contains proposals for major development which will be in conflict with those policies.
55. I consider that the landscape and visual impacts have not been properly assessed in the LVIA. There are significant failures in the document including: failing to include some key viewpoints; not undertaking an assessment during winter; not providing any computer generated images to enable the effect of the development to be more fully assessed; the absence of any detailed assessment of the proposed access at Patrixbourne Road; and not considering the effect of the access road from Patrixbourne Road to the development and the impact of these two specific elements upon the rural character of the rural lane at this point and this part of the conservation area within which it is located.

Living Conditions

56. The proposals will also have a significant impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents in Riverside Close, particularly those whose properties abut or are close to the area identified for two car parks and a village hall. This area is currently part of the recreation ground. A large village hall proposal here together with a substantial 84 space car park partly for the hall and partly for the school will generate a considerable increase in activity and vehicle movements close to residential properties. Those living in Conyngham Lane between the access to the school and the High Street will experience a significant increase in vehicle movements. For many residents there will be a significant and harmful change as a result of the impact from late night events, light pollution, noise and disturbance, particularly at times when residents could reasonably expect tranquility. This would transform this part of the recreation ground and have a significant and harmful impact upon the living conditions of these residents. There also will be a significant increase in traffic along Patrixbourne Road to and from the access to the residential development. An anticipated increase of around 5 vehicle movements per house would result in a total of about

250 additional vehicle movements along Patricxbourne Road. This would have a noticeable impact upon residents.

Flood Risk

57. I am also concerned that the lower part of the site adjacent to the Nailbourne and Patricxbourne Road is liable to flood risk. This may amount to a fundamental objection to the proposals. But if not, in order to overcome any flood risk, this would necessitate an elevated road and bridge extending over the Nailbourne and other areas at risk of flooding. This would increase the visual intrusion, adding to my concerns about the impact upon the protected landscape, the setting of the village and the conservation area.

Need

58. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) refers to possible options for growth being explored with the potential aim of supporting the vitality of the parish and helping to meet local housing needs. However, there has been no in depth assessment to justify the stated conclusion that the vitality of this village needs to be bolstered by additional development. And the local housing needs have also not been properly evaluated with reliance upon an out of date 2017 report.
59. The document refers to a need to deliver a degree of housing through the NP which enables the delivery of affordable housing to meet the village's local needs. Those needs should be evaluated. If there are current local needs which cannot be met, then they could be delivered with a rural exception site. The affordable housing element contained within the proposals is not only unsubstantiated but as Nick Cramer explains in his representation, would not necessarily meet any identified local need but be more widely available to people on the city council's waiting list. By contrast, a rural exception site could meet local needs exclusively and have the added benefit of being much smaller in scale with less visual and landscape impact.
60. The third bullet states: "The allocation offers the opportunity to protect and enhance community provision". This is based upon the erroneous statement which has been made repeatedly that without this development the village will lose its recreation ground. That is incorrect as I have stated and others also have pointed out.
61. The SEA assesses three housing delivery options in section 4. The NP has chosen option 3 which, with the 47 new dwellings, plus windfall

opportunities up to the period to 2035 would amount to more than 50 dwellings. Those options are appraised in table 4.1. The assessment concludes that option 3 has the most potential to lead to significant negative effects in relation to biodiversity, landscape, historic environment, land, soil and water resources.

62. The proposals for affordable housing within the 47 unit scheme appear to be loosely based upon the Housing Needs Survey which is submitted as one of the documents supporting the NP. This survey was undertaken in July 2017. I note that there was only a 33% response rate. The report identified a total need for 11 affordable homes ; 5 for older households.

63. I attach below a link to this survey.

<https://thebridgeplan.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Housing-Needs-Survey-Report-2017.pdf>

64. I consider that not a great deal of weight should be attached to this survey as the response rate was very low and the report is now some 6 years old. Circumstances now may be very different. Nick Cramer makes the relevant point that those occupying the affordable housing within this proposed scheme would be drawn widely from the city council's housing waiting list and would not necessarily have any local connection. So local needs would not be met.

65. Any need for a small development of affordable housing to meet local needs could be delivered by means of a small "exception site" which could be located in a less intrusive, less harmful location.

66. There has been no assessment of the need for a new village hall. Even if there were a need, there has been no consideration as to whether that could be met by dual use of the existing school facilities. There is no analysis of what is required and what space is necessary. In my opinion, a village hall for a rural service centre such as Bridge, should meet the needs of the village and rural community within which it is located, and should not be designed to serve a much wider geographical area which for example might include the southern parts of the city. It is widely known that the larger village halls in the rural settlements are very often booked for parties and events by people outside the local community within which they are situated. The current village hall is small but well located in the heart of the village. It is around 150m² in floor area. The proposals involve a village hall around four times bigger. By way of example to demonstrate how existing facilities on the recreation ground are used, I understand that the tennis club has a very small number of

members who live in the village with the majority coming from outside. The recreation ground itself is booked primarily by football clubs from outside the village. Cricket has not been played on the recreation ground for around 20 years. In my opinion, there is no demonstrable need for a new village hall of this size and in this location.

67. The Kent Downs AONB Unit have previously written in relation to smaller proposals and set out their objections to development on this scale and the conflict with key parts of the NPPF especially paragraphs 176 and 177.

Further Criticisms

68. In addition to my detailed critique of the NP, its supporting documents and the planning considerations, I have the following more general criticisms.
69. The altered recreation ground has a number of disadvantages including:
- It is less attractive as an area of informal recreation space for the village, further away from the village, and significantly noisier because of its close proximity to the elevated and heavily trafficked A2.
 - It is less effective as recreation space because of the substantial increase in formal pitches rather than an emphasis upon informal recreation ground.
 - It is further away from the village and its residents and therefore less accessible.
 - The existing recreation ground is a beautiful, tranquil, cohesive whole. The new proposals will fragment and urbanise the space.
70. All of this will make it less effective as the village recreation ground.
71. The field upon which the new housing and the recreation ground is proposed to be provided acts as an important natural cordons to the village and its recreation ground and forms something of a transition area, separating the village from the A2 and providing a link to the countryside beyond. The proposals will significantly change its character and erode those important benefits.

72. The development comprises 47 houses accessed by a road which extends across an agricultural field. That access road will inevitably have at least one footway/cycleway and lighting. It will transform the character of the field. It then leads to what amounts to a cul-de-sac of 47 houses. The scheme has something of an anywhere/nowhere generic suburban appearance and character. There is little to suggest that it reflects local character other than other generic suburban housing development within the village. That is not a positive characteristic and by taking a greenfield site and developing it in this way, it has a harmful impact upon the conservation area and the AONB landscape.

Conclusion

73. Paragraph 176 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. The NP has not effectively assessed that harm because of the limitations of its document assessing the landscape and visual impact. The proposals involve a significant change to a substantial area of AONB countryside which is currently a mixture of arable farmland or open village recreation ground. The introduction of 47 houses, an 84 vehicle car park and a village hall of between 500m² and 600m² will not conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of this AONB. The proposals would also harm the character and appearance of the Bifrons Park Conservation Area.
74. There are no exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify allowing that harm. There is no risk of loss of the recreation ground in the future as has been fully explained by others. And nor is there any realistic prospect of the city council imposing a substantial housing allocation which would cause unacceptable harm to the AONB, to the conservation areas, and to the setting of the village.
75. There has been no assessment as to whether a new village hall is necessary. Nor has there been any evaluation as to whether or not the existing village hall is sufficient to serve the needs of this village and its rural hinterland. The housing needs study was undertaken more than 6 years ago and is out of date. If there is a need then an exception site could be identified to meet those local needs. Consequently, the damaging impact upon the AONB is not in the public interest. The proposal in fact has few benefits. In my opinion, those do not constitute a package of exceptional benefits within the terms of paragraph 177 of the NPPF.

76. The exceptional circumstances identified at the beginning of the NP are not supported by facts. There is no risk of substantial, uncontrolled housing allocations within the village. And the proposed development is not necessary in order for the village to retain its recreation ground. There are no exceptional circumstances which justify the development.
77. Overall, the proposals are in serious conflict with current Development Plan policies and the NPPF in relation to the protection of the AONB landscape and the character and appearance of conservation areas. These policies are unlikely to change in the future. The NP proposals are not in accordance with the Development Plan and I have demonstrated that there are no other material considerations which indicate that the Cantley proposals should be supported.
78. Finally, although the council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, paragraph 177 of the NPPF provides a clear reason for rejecting the Cantley proposals. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development resulting from the council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply is not engaged.



Consultations CCC <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

Paul Ferguson [REDACTED]

17 July 2023 at 10:00

To: Consultations Ccc <consultations@canterbury.gov.uk>

Dear Consultations,
Please find attached my further submissions.
Thank you.
Regards



FergusonP Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Response Additional 17072023.pdf

139K

Paul Ferguson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

17 July 2023

Dear Examiner,

I write further to my representation of 9 June 2023.

1. Regarding my representation: "2. Bridge Parish Council has not complied with reg 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. As the responsible authority it has not consulted upon the SEA", the following emails have been received:

From: "SM-NE-Consultations (NE)" [REDACTED]

Date: 5 June 2023 at 15:55:20 BST

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Query regarding SEA for Bridge Neighbourhood Plan (Canterbury)

Our reference – 436422

Dear Paul Ferguson,

Many thanks for your email concerning the SEA of the latest Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. According to our records, Natural England was last consulted concerning the SEA on 12th May 2017, responding on 12th July 2017; as far as I can ascertain, we have not received any further consultation regarding the SEA.

We have been recently been consulted concerning Regulation 16 of Bridge Neighbourhood Plan; this is currently with our Sussex & Kent Area Team who will respond to it in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Ball

Operations Delivery, Consultations Team

Natural England, County Hall, Spetchley Road, Worcester, WR5 2NP

From: Paul Ferguson [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 May 2023 18:43
To: SM-NE-Consultations (NE) [REDACTED]
Subject: Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Natural England,

I am hoping you can assist with a query.

Has NE been consulted upon the SEA in respect of the current Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?

Thank you.

Best regards,
Paul Ferguson

From: Katie Miller [REDACTED]
Date: 25 May 2023 at 15:12:50 BST
To: Paul Ferguson [REDACTED]
Subject: Bridge NP

Hi Paul – No, just the published documents currently on the CCC website.

Kind regards

Katie

Katie Miller MRTPI
Planning Manager

Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit

From: Paul Ferguson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2023 12:33 PM
To: Katie Miller [REDACTED]
Subject: Bridge NP

Hi Katie,

Has the AONB Unit been consulted on the Bridge NP SEA?

Thanks.

Best regards,
Paul Ferguson

2. Regarding my representation: “11. Para 4.22 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan refers to the pre-A2 construction AONB designation. The attached planning committee minutes refer to the A2 and recognise the proposed policy C2 development site’s “considerable landscape value with many fine trees and forms an important part of the setting of the villages of Bridge and Patrixbourne””, the point is that the conservation area was designated post-A2 construction.

Sincerely,

Paul Ferguson

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

I think the overall vision is on the right track, a positive response to the challenges that lie ahead.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

It is vitally important that the village maintains and develop community-led businesses that provide both employment and services for local residents, and ensures that Bridge doesn't turn into an empty dormitory town. There are already several empty shops on the high street, I think the parish council could do more to liaise with the landlords and discuss possible uses for the empty properties that would benefit the village. Bringing back a full time post office would be a start.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Regarding provision of additional parking. This can be a double-edged sword, as it can just encourage more vehicular traffic. Improving public transport is a better option.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

High speed internet access is essential for all modern business and consumers. Bridge cannot afford to be left behind.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

While fewer people are using post office services nowadays, the presence of a post office is important as it helps develop a sense of community.

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The development of dedicated cycle lanes will be highly beneficial but will take a lot of planning to make the network function properly. The Canterbury network is a mess and serves neither cyclists or motorists.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Policies should always discourage the use vehicular traffic but if suitable off-street parking can be found that would help. The town of Abingdon in Oxfordshire, for example, has a very convenient carpark on farmland just south of the bridge over the Thames that keeps cars away from the town centre. A similar scheme - on a smaller scale - could be looked at in Bridge.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The lay-by next to the convenience store is a good place to start.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Will this be enforced with speed cameras on the high street?

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

There are obvious benefits to improved public transport. But encouraging the bus companies to switch to electric vehicles would help as well.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

It is currently possible to cycle to Canterbury from Patricbourne along the North Downs Way, so one option could be to link that route to Bridge using the underpass beneath the A2 adjacent to the end of Conyngham Lane and along the footpath/private road to Patricbourne roundabout. This of course would require consent from the land owner but logistically it should be feasible with proper gate management for livestock. This route would provide a safer passage for children who wish to cycle from canterbury or other villages to Bridge school.

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

See above. 3a.

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Retain the character of village is important, as is ensuring that any additional housing is balanced with sufficient infrastructure and services.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Generally agree with the general approach but it should not be over-regulated.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The proposed site seems the most logical area for housing development in the village. The other three proposed sites are entirely unsuited to housing development if the overall aims of the neighbourhood plan are to be achieved.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Protection of the Nailbourne should be a priority in assessing housing development. The council can be proactive in discussing SuDS with developers.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

General agreement with the exception of a Neighbourhood Watch scheme that can increase suspicion of outsiders and lead to unnecessary conflict. Bridge is a relatively low crime area and there is no need for a higher police presence. Careful consideration should be given to what authority if any should be granted to community support staff.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Public rights of way provide important links with other villages and help reduce the need for vehicular traffic.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

This project is a bit vague but the objective is fine.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Local schools should be for local children. Reducing the number of cars coming into the village on school days should be a high priority for the council.

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

General support for the principle of keeping a clear separation between Bridge and further development in south Canterbury as outlined in Project E1.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Name: * | Geoffrey Crothall |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

This NP does not meet this basic condition regarding national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. 'By encouraging new sustainable development as per NPPF 2021 paragraphs 8 and 9' is the one and only driver of the NP. The NP is a vehicle to gain funding for a new village hall and car parking by supporting the landowner / developer to build 47 houses on land designated as; AONB, Bifrons Conservation Area, Grade 1 agricultural land, an Asset of Community Value (ACVFN31) and defined as Local Green Space designation in the draft CDLP 2045 (SLAA271). The NP building proposal was rejected CDLP 2045 as 'not suitable' (SLAA217). Parish Council communications at Reg 14 and in the NP have intentionally created bias in favour of the plan. The following have been used to drive public opinion on the NP and are not true: We could lose the recreation ground at end of the lease, there are housebuilding targets imposed on the village, the affordable housing will be allocated by the village for those in the village, the NP will prevent the landowner or CCC allocating future housing targets, the Parish Council will control 'windfall' housing. Regulation 14; Consulting on, and publicising, a neighbourhood plan or Order. Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 41-047-20140306, demonstrates the village have been denied their right to be 'kept fully informed of what is being proposed' and 'to make their views known throughout the process'. CDLP 2045 is draft, but direction of travel can still inform. With the 'Local Green Space' designation approved for this area, CDLP, OS1 requires 'very special circumstances' and LB1 'will not be permitted except in exceptional circumstances'. Also NPPF 176, 177, 188 demonstrate this NP gives a wholly unacceptable balance of benefit against the damage especially since community benefits are not material planning considerations, <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2017/2102.html>

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The draft NP had supported the landowner's proposal for industrial units at Great Pett Farmyard and would have demonstrated true commitment under this NP to this objective. 'The Plan will therefore endeavour to support any potential appropriate long-term employment opportunities. New small-scale business development in the village will therefore be encouraged, wherever possible'. However instead of driving these proposals into the NP the Parish Council have allowed their removal and stated outside of the NP that they would support 9 additional houses at Great Pett Farm instead, they have not included these in the NP as it takes them above threshold set in the SEA. Although the words sound good the reality is not. In order to support local business we do not need an NP, this is simply good common sense, this NP Objective adds little to building proposal except some window dressing.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding. It is clear transport is important but we do not need an NP statement to drive this there is enough in the CDLP.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding. In this case successive Parish Councils have stated this as a target to 'expand the local cycle network' but nothing has happened there is no reason to believe that having an NP will change this. The second part simply informs us that this is part of the specification of the development proposals for the 47 houses should provide traffic free cycle and pedestrian routes wherever possible.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The generation communication and content in this section does not meet the basic conditions in relation to the wider community. There are no targets in the CDLP 2017 or Draft CDLP 2045 for house building in Bridge. It is not possible to bring forward an allocation of housing from the CDLP as there is no allocation. The continued attempt to justify the housebuilding of 47 houses in the village through various calculations without factual basis has been continued by the NP committee throughout Reg 14 review. Regulation 14; Consulting on, and publicising, a neighbourhood plan or Order states in Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 41-047-20140306. A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan or Order and ensure that the wider community: • is kept fully informed of what is being proposed • is able to make their views known throughout the process • has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan or Order • is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan or Order This has not occurred, the wider community have been misinformed through the various stages with the release of limited information and this biases opinion and denies the individuals the right be involved and make input. 4.6 states a need for 11 affordable houses - that were communicated to be allocated by the village for those within the village or connected to the village. The NP proposal affordable houses will be allocated by Canterbury City Council to their requirements. The village have NOT been informed of this. Each of 4.7 to 4.11 are also in error and biased to drive the housing plan, 4.11 was simply a statement of population growth in the size of the village over the duration, none of the villagers will be moving into these new homes they will be almost exclusively purchased by families moving into the village.

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

4.16 states 'the opportunity to secure, in perpetuity for the village,', and 4.17 states 'Alternatively, these recreational and cultural assets would risk having to be relocated or being lost to the village, and hence to the District, at some point after the current lease with the private owner of the freehold of the Recreation Ground expires in 2023.' again the village are being misled. In Nov 2021 on the insistence of members of the village the Parish Council finally obtained legal advice from a specialist land lease solicitor and found to their surprise that they had the legal right to extend the lease at a fair agricultural rent about £500 pa. Therefore there is no risk at all that the recreation ground and facilities will be lost to the village, the lease can be extended again and again. The landowner has now also stated that of course they would extend the lease whether the house building goes ahead or not. The outcome of the legal advice has not been communicated to the village, has not been minuted in the Parish Council meetings and has not been correctly included in the Timeline contained in the Consultation Document which implies that the legal advice states quite the converse. Again the village has been misled on an absolutely key point. In the campaign leaflet used in Nov 2017 as the basis for the village vote on housing, this sets out an offer of community benefits contained in 'The Cantley Proposals' and the leaflet refers to the recreation ground, Bridge Parish Council did not have regard to the publicity code; https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/5670/1878324.pdf for local authorities, as mandated by section 4(1) of the Local Government 1986 Act. In breach of paragraph 6 of this code, it used public funds to mount a publicity campaign with the primary purpose to persuade the public to hold a particular view on a question of plan policy.

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Section 4.22 '....located between the village and A2 Highway, was designated as AONB prior to the construction of the raised carriageways of the A2 by-pass around Bridge....' implies it is no longer AONB but Canterbury City Council reviewed this area of land after the A2 was completed and in a Canterbury City Council planning meeting of 31st Jan 1995 case summary DCA2354, it was concluded that the land remained an important part of the AONB and Bifrons Park Conservation Areas. See link to meeting documents; <http://documents.canterbury.gov.uk/publisher/mvc/listDocuments?identifier=Conservation&uidno=DCA2354> The Local Green Space definition brings protection under CDLP 2017 policy OS1 and OS9. Although the CDLP 2045 is still in draft, this does demonstrate a clear direction of travel over the future use of this land, which I believe is a material consideration within this review. It is clear under Local Plan OS1 that the building proposal within the NP does not demonstrate 'very special circumstances' and it clearly does 'material harm to the contribution the protected open space makes to the visual or recreational amenity of the area'. Policy LB1 states 'Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty High priority will be given to conservation and enhancement of natural beauty in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and planning decisions should have regard to its setting. Major developments and proposals which conflict with the objective conflict with the objective to conserve and enhance the AONB, or that endanger tranquillity, will not be permitted except in exceptional circumstances where it is demonstrated to be in the public interest, the need is shown and any detrimental effect is moderated or mitigated...' There is no evidence in the NP to demonstrate the building plan could be classified as 'exceptional circumstances' or that it is 'in the public interest' once all the points of bias are corrected and public informed.

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

In extension to comments under C2. The objective of the NP to achieve funding for a village hall and car park through supporting major development is an unacceptable compromise for the village and the environment and must be weighed against the policies in the National Policy Planning Framework. • '176. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.' and • '177. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.' • '188. The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes)....' With the Mountfield development of 4000 houses within a few minutes, the vitality of the village and businesses will be maintained, the village really does not need nor want these houses. It is only through the drive of the landowner and the desire of the Parish Council to gain benefit from the landowner a contribution to a village hall that this NP exists at all. Any support from the village is uncertain, due to the intentional and ongoing bias in the process that is intended to drive opinions. Section 4.24 'Following the Call for Sites, only the one site came forward' that is not the case there was a suitable rural exception site at Brickfields for affordable housing that actually met the needs of the village to be allocated by the village for those in the village.

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consultation Appendix D Environmental Report No consultation has been carried out with the statutory consultees; Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency or the public on the Strategic Environmental Assessment to enable consultees to offer views on any aspect of the SEA process which has been carried out to date. This fails the legislative requirements and the basic conditions against The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Section 13. There was no indication in these documents as to how consultation responses to the SEA would be considered and how feedback would be provided to consultees.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding. Policy E2 section 6.12 'The Parish Council will seek to maintain open spaces including areas within the Parish that are of particular value to the community.... This Plan has identified seven such areas which are mapped out and described on the following pages. These areas, identified as Important Local Green Spaces..' This simply excludes the areas proposed for building in the NP which again introduces bias and identifies the primary purpose of the NP.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The words are good but again it is not a reason for the NP and is simply window dressing for the NP as a vehicle for driving the proposed housebuilding.

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

Consultation Statement: The consultation statement submitted with the draft neighbourhood plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the plan proposals. Bridge Neighbourhood Plan fails to comply with the legal requirements set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ('the 2012 Regulations'). Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) explains, the qualifying body should be open and inclusive in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan and ensure that the wider community is kept fully informed of what is being proposed; is able to make their views known throughout the process; has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan and is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan. The consultation process and timeline included in the document does not sufficiently detail those consulted, explain how they were consulted, summarise the main issues and concerns raised, describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the neighbourhood plan. In some cases, such as the obtaining of legal advice on the recreation ground lease and the result of legal advice, how that was communicated and acted upon. In this case the information presented is misleading comes to wrong conclusions, was not communicated back to those who raised the issue and with no further action taken which is not procedurally compliant with the legal requirements set out in the Regulations.

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Name: * | Nick Cramer |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | N/A |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

The benefits of 47 houses to the village is minimal as likely bought by people outside the village the affordable housing proposed does not comply with the requirements of the village, that they can be allocated by the village for those in the village. The houses will be allocated by Canterbury City Council based on their priorities The funding proposed by the landowner and developer has been significantly reduced and is stated on the proposal as a 'minimum of £200K' The village requirement for a new replacement village hall and car parking have not been fully reviewed and assessed, nor have the alternative funding options via funding assistance or fundraising reviewed in the NP without having to commit to building 47 houses to fund it. To drive these objectives the NP team have created bias by communicating to each house in the village that there is a threat of loss of the recreation ground if the do not support the house building requirements also that the current proposed development of affordable housing is to be allocated by the village for village use. Neither of these statements are now true. There are no targets for housing in the parish area and clearly this is not an 'exceptional circumstance' and cannot justify building 47 houses on protected land. The Parish Council NP team have not been 'inclusive and open' in their preparation of The Bridge Neighbourhood Pan, the wider community has not been kept fully informed about what is being proposed which has prevented the wider community from conducting effective review and making their views known.

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

I have made my views clear in my initial comment

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

Please see my initial comments which make my view clear. Essentially you have failed to have an open and inclusive consultation have been opaque and misleading you have not prioritised the requirements of the village and the environment rather the wishes of the developer and are attempting to slip in your plans without true open and honest consultation. So be absolutely clear I object to your proposals.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Maria Shrimpton

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

Neighbourhood Plan does not meet this basic condition regarding national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. There are no targets in the Canterbury District Development Plan 2017 for house building in the village of Bridge. In the case of this NP one of the primary objectives is to support the landowner in the building of 47 houses on land that is designated as AONB, Bifrons Conservation Area, Grade 1 agricultural land, an Asset of Community Value (ACVFN31) and has been defined as Local Green Space designation in the draft CDLP 2045 (SLAA271). The NP building proposal in the call for sites for this area was rejected by Canterbury City Planning as 'not suitable' (SLAA217). Canterbury City Council reviewed this area of land after the A2 was completed and in a Canterbury City Council planning meeting of 31st Jan 1995 case summary DCA2354, it was concluded that the land remained an important part of the AONB and Bifrons Park Conservation Areas. The objective of the housebuilding is simply to obtain a contribution of funding for the building of a village hall and car parking and obtain the recreation ground land freehold. As shown in the NP the house building is not seen as providing a positive contribution to the village itself, despite attempts at justifying targets for housing in the village. The benefits of the houses for the village is minimal as they are likely to be purchased by those outside of the village. With the Mountfield development of 4000 houses within a few minutes, the vitality of the village and businesses will be maintained. The affordable housing proposed in the building scheme does not comply with the requirements set by the village, that they can be allocated by the village for those in the village. These houses will be allocated through Canterbury City Council based on their priorities. The village requirement for a new replacement village hall and car parking have not been fully reviewed and assessed.

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The affordable housing proposed in the building scheme does not comply with the requirements set by the village, that they can be allocated by the village for those in the village. These houses will be allocated through Canterbury City Council based on their priorities

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The objective of the housebuilding is simply to obtain a contribution of funding for the building of a village hall and car parking and obtain the recreation ground land freehold. As shown in the NP the house building is not seen as providing a positive contribution to the village itself, despite attempts at justifying targets for housing in the village.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The benefits of the 47 houses for the village is minimal as they are likely to be purchased by those outside of the village, not assisting with organic growth as implied in the NP. With the Mountfield development of 4000 houses within a few minutes, the vitality of the village and businesses will be maintained

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

There is little support in the village for the additional 47 houses once biases have been removed: • The implied threat of the loss of the recreation ground at lease expiry • The cost of the recreation ground lease • Delivery of suitable affordable housing as specified in the 2017 Housing Needs Survey • Promises from the landowner and Local Authority that they will not target or propose any future development in the life of the plan. • The funding proposed from the landowner for the village hall and car park initially £700K

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☒

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Adding additional unrequired housing will stress the environment.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☒

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The flood risk within the area covered by this Neighbourhood Plan is identified as being so significant that no new residential development within Flood Zone 3 should be supported.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

as above

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

as above

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

The premise of neighbourhood planning is that it is community-led, with the community establishing local (non-strategic) planning policies for development and use of land within its neighbourhood. Neighbourhood Development Plans enable local people to play a leading role in responding to the needs and priorities of the local community.

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

The Parish Council NP team have not been 'inclusive and open' in their preparation of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. The wider community has not been kept fully informed of what is being proposed which has prevented the wider community from conducting effective review and making their views known

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

as above

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

as above

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

The Parish Council NP team have not been ‘inclusive and open’ in their preparation of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. The wider community has not been kept fully informed of what is being proposed which has prevented the wider community from conducting effective review and making their views known.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Name: * | Dr William Lloyd Hughes |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☐ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☒

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☒

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Southern Water understands the intention to protect Local Green Spaces. However, as we explained in our responses at Pre-Submission stage in 2022, we cannot support the current wording of policy E4 as it could create barriers to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development allocated in the District or Neighbourhood Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) establishes in paragraph 103 that Local Green Space policies should be consistent with those for Green Belts, which identifies in paragraph 150 that 'certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate' including 'engineering operations'. In addition, paragraph 147 sets the intention of ruling out inappropriate development 'except in very special circumstances'. Paragraph 148 explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Southern Water therefore considers the current wording contrary to National Planning Policy as it does not make allowances for development in 'very special circumstances'. Special circumstances can exist for the provision of essential water or wastewater infrastructure (e.g a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there can be limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. By ruling out all development other than that proposed elsewhere in the Plan, Policy E4 may not meet the basic conditions necessary for a Neighbourhood Plan to have regard to national planning policy. Proposed wording addition to Policy E4 to ensure consistency with the NPPF - , except in very special circumstances, for example where it is for the provision of essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs harm or loss.

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to water or wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. We could find no policies to support the general provision of new or improved utilities infrastructure. The NPPF (2021) paragraph 28 establishes that communities should set out detailed policies for specific areas including 'the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level'. Also the National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'. To ensure consistency with the NPPF and facilitate sustainable development, we proposed an additional policy as follows: New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Name: * | Catherine Adamson |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | Southern Water |
| Address: * | [Redacted] |
| Postcode: * | [Redacted] |
| Email address: | [Redacted] |
| Telephone number: | [Redacted] |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

I agree with the vision and purpose of the plan and believe it's an important part of self-determination for the village.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

Having a voice in the development of our village is incredibly important. Especially in the current state of affairs where residents are unfairly pitted against the developers and city council planners.

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

It is important to maintain the character of our village.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

There is a need for more local housing, as established in the Housing Needs Survey. Up to this point, the land owners and developers have also worked closely with the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Committee to establish the foundation of this policy. Few villages have had such a privilege; instead having developments thrust upon them with little to no benefit or say in the matter. Owning the recreation ground and having a new village hall would be a huge benefit to the village.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

It's clear that our central planners do not put enough emphasis on ensuring that there is adequate infrastructure to deal with new housing developments.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Name: * | Neil Kirk |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

Excellent document. Well overdue and needs to be implemented in its entirety. Thanks to the parish council for its persistence and foresight

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * Philip Wicker

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [redacted]

Postcode: * [redacted]

Email address: [redacted]

Telephone number: [redacted]

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Strongly disagree with the proposal of Cantley Estates. The Recreation Ground in its entirety should be preserved to village use and not built on. Control over the village's recreational resources is protected by the existing lease. The proposed housing development would be unlikely to provide the new village hall and community facilities as experience has shown that developers often make these promises at the planning stage but then withdraw them later on the grounds of viability. Bridge Village would prefer to have full control of the process rather than be dependent on a developer. This is not the only way that affordable housing could be delivered. Again developers have often reneged on affordable housing on the grounds of viability after planning permission has been granted. There is no way of securing affordable housing for Bridge Residents, any affordable housing would be for general housing need in the district so there is no advantage in chasing affordable housing through the development process for Bridge Residents.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Control over the village's recreational resources is protected by the existing lease which can be renewed. There are other designations which protect the recreation ground from development. Having freehold ownership is not the only way of protecting the recreation ground in perpetuity. proposed housing development would be unlikely to provide the new village hall and community facilities as experience has shown that developers often make these promises at the planning stage but then withdraw them later on the grounds of viability. This is not the only way that affordable housing could be delivered, a housing association could build a small development of shared ownership/ affordable rent and designate this for people with a connection to Bridge village. This would be the only justification for building on this land.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

The Nailbourne must be safeguarded / flood risk mitigated and there is no guarantee that this current government will maintain Water Framework Directives

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * Rosa Maria Lehmann

Business or organisation name (if applicable):

Address: * [Redacted]

Postcode: * [Redacted]

Email address: [Redacted]

Telephone number: [Redacted]

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan? If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * John Corfield

Business or organisation name (if applicable):

Address: * [Redacted]

Postcode: * [Redacted]

Email address:

Telephone number: [Redacted]

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

The plan's overall vision is excellent, and a credit to the hard work, enthusiasm, and dedication of the members of Bridge Parish Council, and provide a clear way forward for logical, and sustainable, development of the village into the future, whilst maintaining the essential character and separate identity of the village. I moved to Bridge in 1970, and hope to remain in the village for the remainder of my life.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

It provides a sound basis for maintaining development of businesses within the village, which are an essential part of the character of the village. Whilst so many villages have lost their businesses, Bridge has maintained theirs, which is what makes the village special - it has a vibrant heart.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

It provides controlled development whilst respecting the essential character of the village.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

For the controlled development of the village.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

As previous answer

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Better safe links to Canterbury for greener forms of movement (walking, cycling) are required. Crossing a very busy road because the pavement changes sides is not acceptable with today's level of traffic.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

As above

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The steady growth of car ownership in the village will probably continue, and any future development must take this into account.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

It maintains the character of the village, which is essential. It addresses the use of modern technology for future developements.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Essential considering the problems we have experienced in the past.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

To maintain, whenever possible, the present character of the village for the foreseeable future.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Agree, but remedial conditions at the planning stage, in light of technical developments, might alleviate the risk of property flooding.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Whilst the Canterbury by-pass creates a natural barrier between Bridge and Canterbury, the separate identity of Bridge must be maintained.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

To maintain the essence of what makes Bridge village special.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Once lost, green spaces are usually lost forever.

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

Light pollution is an increasing problem and must be considered in any future development.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

To maintain the character of the village.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

See previous answer

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

This is a once only chance to preserve the past before it is lost in a developement

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

I support it entirely. I have found this feedback (for a person born before computers) difficult and feel it may well deter many from completing their feedback. A far simpler form would be beneficial. My assessment of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan is that it is excellent, addresses the existing situation in a realistic manner, and in my opinion, is the be thoroughly recommend. I support the whole plan without reservation.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Name: * | David Spencer |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

Bridge residents are keen to maintain Bridge's village identity, so I very much support the Plan's aim to keep Bridge separate from Canterbury. However, with the words... "by encouraging new sustainable development..." the vision sets out an inappropriate ambition. Bridge lies within an AONB, and various areas within it and around it are designated Conservation Areas, so any concept of 'encouraging development' would be damaging to the village, the AONB and other protected areas. This ambition must be quashed! As things stand, the Canterbury District Plan to 2045 sensibly draws a boundary line around the existing developed areas of Bridge and rules out further development on the greenfield land around the village. This Neighbourhood Plan should not conflict with that. Furthermore, any notion of 'sustainable building development' on prime farmland, in the Garden of England, in an AONB and Conservation Area (therefore officially one of the most protected spaces in western Europe) is complete nonsense. We must not develop on this land.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☒ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The ambition, "To Maintain a Choice of High-Quality Homes With Good Design..." within an AONB and Conservation Area is a misguided one. A choice for whom? and why? Why present this option when there is to be huge housing development just minutes away in each direction. In answer, the Objective contradicts itself, first by stating in point 4.1 "The Neighbourhood Plan will encourage only a limited amount of housing, to assist towards meeting local needs." then by proposing to build 47 houses, when the Plan's own Housing Needs Survey indicated a (supposed) need for 11 (affordable) homes within the parish. We must conclude therefore that the other 36 houses (to be sold presumably at market value) are merely speculative development. What justifies this speculative development on prime farm land within a Conservation Area within an AONB in the Garden of England? NO EVIDENCE IS GIVEN, BECAUSE THERE CAN BE NO JUSTIFICATION.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Policy C1 states, "All development must be designed to a high quality, responding to the heritage, landscape and locally distinctive character of Bridge as described in the Bridge Architectural Legacy statement." Were the Plan to genuinely respond to 'the heritage, landscape and locally distinctive character of Bridge' then new development on greenfield land would not be proposed. Within the Policy, a number of criteria to define the standard of new building are assembled in a list 'a' to 'n'. Yet, were these criteria to be genuinely respected, the demands of points a,b,c,d,e,f,h,i,j,k,l,m, would rule out building in this location altogether. Once again the Plan contradicts itself by pretending lofty, ecologically responsible ambitions which respect the location, while promoting unnecessary, unsuitable development within a protected landscape.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

While it Policy C2 sounds beneficial to the village in its ambitions to take freehold control of 'our' Recreation Ground, this Policy has been presented within the Plan and to parishioners in a confusing manner. It implies that the village Recreation Ground is under threat of being removed and must be 'safeguarded' for the use of village residents. However, as I understand it, no such circumstance prevails: in fact, the village has a statutory right to rent the land and extend the lease at a very reasonable cost. As for the stated aim of the Policy, 'the transfer of the Recreation Ground freehold from private ownership to Bridge Parish Council so as to enable the community use of the Recreation Ground in perpetuity', the Plan again contradicts itself in that it proposes, as part of a deal with the landowner's agent to build a village hall with attached car park on a substantial section of the Recreation Ground, thereby diminishing the usable area of the current piece of land.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Policy C3 is intended as a protection against inappropriate development which exacerbates the current drainage and sewerage problems within the Nailbourne Valley. However, rather ironically, it achieves its purpose: the very requirements within it serve merely to highlight why this is not an appropriate area in which to build. As recent flooding, river pollution and sewer failures have demonstrated, the entire valley has inadequate drainage and sewerage infrastructure, so, unless a complete rebuild of the valley's drains and sewers is proposed, any new building development is inappropriate. I have no faith in the promises of trendy new 'eco-babble' 'sustainable drainage systems' to solve what is essentially a problem of building too many houses in a river valley prone to flooding.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

I object to the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan on the grounds that it contains numerous inaccuracies and failings which have resulted in a confused, vague, contradictory Plan. In my opinion, community involvement has been lacking and some expert local advice has been ignored. Had a wider spectrum of advice been sought and accepted at the outset, some of the inaccuracies and confusion in the Plan may have been clarified. I list just some of the Plan's contradictions:

1. The Plan suggests it wants to restrict development, yet proposes development where none is currently required by any other authority.
2. The Plan tells us it wants only housing to suit local people's needs, yet where a need for 11 (affordable) homes has been established, the Plan proposes 47 (most presumably to be for sale at current market value).
3. The Plan claims to protect local green spaces, yet proposes to build a village hall on one of them, and intends to build new houses on adjoining agricultural fields.
4. The Plan claims to support only sensitively designed and placed, sustainable development, yet proposes new housing with a village hall and car park in a Conservation Area.
5. The Plan claims to safeguard our recreation ground, but the recreation ground is not under threat.
6. The Plan proposes a new village hall and car park, yet fails to adequately explain where full funding will come from, other than with what appears as a vague offer from a third party should planning permission for houses be granted.
7. The Plan insists that support for new development will only be given if drain and sewer infrastructure are designed to cope, yet it proposes development where drain and sewer infrastructure already cannot cope.
8. The Plan pretends to be concerned about light pollution in Conservation Areas, yet proposes to build houses and a village hall with a car park in a Conservation Area.

In its current iteration this Plan is wholly unsuitable for Bridge parish and it should be rejected.

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * M Burns-Stark

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [Redacted]

Postcode: * [Redacted]

Email address: [Redacted]

Telephone number:

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☐ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

I am in agreement with the logical and well considered plan that understands the necessity to allow developments, whilst retaining the green spaces, encouraging environmental support and retaining the character and heritage of the village.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The introduction of a dedicated cycle lane would have a substantial impact in reduction of peak hour traffic by allowing a safe journey for workers/school children into Canterbury.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Nicole Reader

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address:

Telephone number:



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

Bridge needs this plan. It has been many, many years in the making. It has been well researched and consulted upon and needs to move forward for the future of the village.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

While it is always sad to see productive agricultural land used for development, all villages are under pressure via central government policies to provide more and more housing. This plan contains a minimal number of new properties, compared with nearby developments. The quid pro quo of the recreation ground car park and village hall will be enormously beneficial for the entire village.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The policies and projects contained in this section are all fine, but there is no mention of solar panels or air source heat pumps. Every single new build should have these fitted by the developers and that should be a policy in the plan.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Name: * | Mark Esdale |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

Good

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Sensible approach to business support

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Sustainable travel should be a priority

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Support the housing proposal and the amenities it will provide to the community

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Health of the community is important and the provision of additional allotments should be considered along with a community orchard

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

It would be unwise to build on a flood zone. We don't want to be joined to Canterbury - we need to maintain our independence

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

We have some important archeological sites so this is important

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

This survey is very poorly put together and I'm afraid it will lead to people not completing this important document. Why didn't the council list the objective along with the question? For question A I wasn't sure I was answering the objectives on page 29 or 9

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Name: * | Jane Martin |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

Well thought through

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Businesses are important to the community

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

- 1a. Why? Please write in below
- A cycle path would be great

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

- 2a. Why? Please write in below
- As long as air monitoring is acted upon

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☒ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Not sure this would make a difference

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

Buses are important but could be cleaner

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

This would be fantastic

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The proposed housing is in the right place and would provide much needed houses that fit the local community.
Provision of parking for school would be fantastic

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Footpaths should be maintained along with green spaces

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

I support the village plan and it's proposals

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * David Martin

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * 

Postcode: * 

Email address:

Telephone number:

☐

Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☐ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Having a sustainable transport system is important to the residents of Bridge.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The quality of air impacts everyone living and visiting Bridge and should be monitored. At School drop off and pick up there is a build up of traffic leading to poor air quality.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

A good public transport system will support residents of the Bridge to reduce their reliance on their cars.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

Parking is a problem in particular during school drop off and pick up times.

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Maintaining green spaces is important - if the housing development gets the go ahead then the allotment provision could be increased with consideration for a community orchard/garden

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

It is important that Bridge does not become a suburb of Canterbury and we maintain our independence

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The increased provision of allotments would be great and welcomed. A community orchard and community garden would be a great asset to Bridge.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * Bridge Allotment Association

Business or organisation name (if applicable): Bridge Allotment Association

Address: * [Redacted]

Postcode: * [Redacted]

Email address: [Redacted]

Telephone number:

☐ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

The plan takes a realistic view of the future for Bridge

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

It is a well conceived plan, taking into account a realistic assessmentb of the present and likely future of \bridge

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Name: * | John Hill |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☐ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

Broadly agree

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * A Walder

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

I fully support the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan and its objectives and vision

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

It recognises the need to support businesses whilst protecting the village environment

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

It recognises the need to support businesses whilst protecting the village environment and also parking requirements

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Good internet access is vital for everyone, not only businesses

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Post Office has an important part to play, especially for people working and running a business from home

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

Safe cycling routes are an essential to encourage the use of cycles as opposed to car use

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

Safe cycling routes are an essential to encourage the use of cycles as opposed to car use

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Car parking is already a problem in Bridge at certain times of the day

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Any measures to alleviate car use and their effect on the village environment are welcome

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Any measures to alleviate car use and their effect on the village environment are welcome

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

Any measures to alleviate car use and their effect on the village environment are welcome

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

Any measures to alleviate car use and their effect on the village environment are welcome

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

Any measures to alleviate car use and their effect on the village environment are welcome

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

All new building and development should be of a standard which enhances and does not detract from the village overall

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

All new building and development should be of a standard which enhances and does not detract from the village overall

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

This is very much needed in the village

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Flooding has been a problem in the past and this policy addresses problems new build could cause

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

This policy protects vital open space

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

This policy protects vital open space

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

access to open space is vital

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Children should have the right to go to their local school

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Sound common sense to address the problem of climate change and flooding

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Sound common sense to address the problem of climate change and flooding

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Essential to maintain the separation of Bridge from Canterbury

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Allows control of future development

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Endorses need for open space

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

Light pollution is a problem and excess lighting in a rural environment is not necessary

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

Agree wholeheartedly that the open space between Bridge and Canterbury MUST be maintained

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

Commendable and in line with healthy environment

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

the character of the village must be maintained and respected in any new development

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

the character of the village must be maintained and respected in any new development

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

There could be important archaeological finds due to the history of the village

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

I am pleased to see that the Plan has now reached this stage of consultation and would commend it to parishioners. It is a necessary tool which will allow Bridge to have a say in its future, particularly if unwanted pressures are put upon the Parish

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

Name: * Kathryn Walder

Business or organisation name (if applicable):

Address: * [Redacted]

Postcode: * [Redacted]

Email address: [Redacted]

Telephone number:

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?**
* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

- 1a. **Why?** Please write in below

Bridge has always been a commercial 'hub' for the surrounding rural area, and it is vital , if this is to continue , that the three of four 'voids' in the high street are filled with appropriate commercial activity.

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1?** *
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

- 2a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Policy A2 is missing

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

We agree with Objective B, but believe it should go further. We strongly endorse the idea of a safe cycle route to Canterbury, given the proximity to Bridge of secondary schools in Canterbury . We also support encouragement of a 'Walking Bus'. However, the speed of motor vehicles coming down the hills from the Canterbury and Dover directions, and along the Patricbourne Road, make cycling and walking in Bridge unsafe. The addition of 47 new dwellings, with at least as many motor vehicles, leaving and re-entering the village at some time during the day, will make this worse. We endorse the Projects incorporated in Objective B at the end of the Plan. However, given the proximity of the proposed site for major development to the Patricbourne Road we urge the City Council to impose as a condition of grant the funding by the developer , via Section 106 or CiL , of a roundabout, or other equally effective traffic-slowing measure on the Patricbourne Road just outside its entry into the built-up area of the village.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The success of existing shops,cafes, and inns, and of the primary school, brings with it a major problem with parking

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

There is no B3

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

No B4

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

No B5

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

We agree with the assessment of housing need . We wish to add that the Objective should be stronger with regard to affordability. We refer to Policy DS1 ('Affordable Housing ') in the draft Canterbury Local Plan.This states that development proposals for 10 or more dwellings shall provide at least 30% affordable housing, and that of this figure two-thirds shall be for affordable or social rent. The City Council's consultants, Edge Analytics,, in their analysis of Housing Need in the District,concluded taht 40% of all newly-forming households in the District between now and 2045 would not be able to afford the lowest quartile open market rent. We believe Bridge should play its full part in providing accommodation for these new households.We ask that for the major development of 47 houses proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan at least 14 (30%) shall be affordable, and that of these 8(two-thirds of 30%) shall be for SOCIAL rent

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Given that the proposed major development would be in the Kent Downs AONB, we believe that the quality of design of the houses should be commensurate with that status. We also believe that all new houses should be the closest to 'zero-carbon' that the National Planning Policy Framework allows. We assume that the City Council would insist on efficient sustainable drainage systems , to ensure that run-off does not compromise the quality of the water in the lakes at the Stodmarsh SSSI. Again, as the proposed site is within the Kent Downs AONB, we believe it is vital to choose native trees for the necessary landscaping. We would also urge the Council to insist on the maximum number of trees to be planted, and maintained, in order to capture the carbon emissions hat will result from the development.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The development of the proposed site would bring with it the transfer to the parish council of ownership of land on which valued community facilities are located , and thus ensure their continuation. It would also facilitate the building a new , fit-for-purpose village hall, much needed by the village.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

In recent years many dwellings in the village have suffered from foul effluent back-up, and the need for tankering. This has happened for two reasons: the fracturing of the main sewer, and of lateral drainage pipes in the purlieu of the private dwellings themselves, with consequent flooding of foul sewers by rainwater. It is vital, therefore, that the developer can assure the village without a shadow of doubt that the main foul sewer is capable of removing the foul effluent that their development will generate, and that the laterals from new dwellings can withstand any pressures imposed on them.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

No D2

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|------------|
| Name: * | Martin Vye |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | |
| Address: * | |
| Postcode: * | |
| Email address: | |
| Telephone number: | |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

I understand that more homes are needed. The area of the recreation ground is not used greatly by the local children so presents the best option for the new homes. Children of families in the new homes must get priority for spaces in the bridge primary school.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The development of recreation ground is the best of a bad bunch of areas to build on.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Buildings should look in keeping with the majority of existing residential homes. Not copy the trend of ugly properties being built in Canterbury centre e.g. the old dairy depot on military road.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Best of a bad bunch of local land to develop on.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Drainage should be done responsibly and sustainably to protect the local ecology and existing homes.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Darryn Probert

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

i strongly agree with Bridge Neighbourhood Plan, as the Parish Council have spent many years now adjusting and fine-tuning it, at the request of the City Council. I therefore sincerely hope that notice will be taken of the Parish Council's recommendations.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

I do hope the recommendations of the Parish Council will be seriously taken into consideration when planning for the future of the village. Much thought, consultation and hard work has been done to produce this Neighbourhood Plan, which makes good and well thought-out proposals.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Name: * | Mrs Joan Hill |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | n/a |
| Address: * | [REDACTED] |
| Postcode: * | [REDACTED] |
| Email address: | [REDACTED] |
| Telephone number: | [REDACTED] |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☐ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

This plan needs to move forward

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Andrea Neame

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * 

Postcode: * 

Email address:

Telephone number:

☐

Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

The proposed allocation on Cantley land (Policy C2) will satisfy the Vision, retaining and enhancing existing recreational and open space, and the provision of much needed market and affordable housing. Agree with the supporting text that we welcome the PC bringing forward a NP as localism is an important tenet of the Government's planning objectives. It is important the NP helps determine the community's future direction and this NP has been a number of years in the making and it should now be satisfactorily concluded. Agree with the extent of consultation locally. Cantley has been an active participant in this process for many years. Para 1.7, should this say "in effect until at least 1 September 2037" because if no replacement NP has been made by then, it is reasonable to conclude that whilst outdated, its policies may still have some weight as a development plan document.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Worth noting the allocation site per Policy C2 will have the potential to provide pedestrian/cycle links to connect the Village – linking Conyngham Lane / the primary school, with Patrixbourne Road, and the High Street to the west. This would be an important connection for the village.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The scheme on the Policy C2 land will provide significant off-street parking for the school, relieving congestion from on-street parking on Conyngham Lane and elsewhere in the village at peak times, plus drop off area associated with the Village Hall which will alleviate pressure at school drop-off and pick-up times. It should represent a safety measure for school children.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

see 2a above

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

see 3a above

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☒ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Amend to note "high quality market and affordable homes..." Delivery of both tenures is very significant. Para 4.4, proposals would have effect of creating village on the green with community facilities centred on the Rec Ground with clear ped/cycle/highway connections becoming the focal point of the village, encouraging walking, cycling and leisure opportunities. Para 4.7, 2017 affordable survey identified need for at least 11 affordable units (4.12 refers to 12 units & CCC's 2021 housing needs report (Domus) shows significant district wide housing need). Irrespective, need has not gone away and might now be greater. No affordable housing delivered for a number of years, continuing ad-hoc approach results in no affordable housing. Only a site allocation will achieve this. Policy C2 land will meet the identified need fully, which is a significant Exceptional Circumstance. Comprehensive development will deliver significant benefits which can not be achieved without a NP. 2021 census data shows village population of 1538, a 2.4% reduction from 2011, & 32% over-65s. Important new development incl affordable is delivered to contribute to the sustainability & vitality for the plan period. Without this there's a risk the population has plateaued or declining (older population remain in existing under-occupied homes). Need to encourage younger people/families to move in/remain in the village. Para 4.15, yes Bridge is constrained by AONB (and other factors: heritage, flood risk and maintaining a gap with Canterbury), which limits opportunities for growth. The Policy C2 land offers an appropriate opportunity. Construction of the A2 with the road in an elevated section has physically and functionally separated it from from the wider AONB and in landscape and visual terms. Immediately bound by built form on 3 sides and by the elevated A2. Para 4.16, add the allocation satisfies the NP vision, add the school parking will be provided.

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Para 4.20 – Exceptional Circumstances include not only the PC having permanent and secure ownership of the Recreation Ground to be an important community asset, but other EC also include meeting an identified need for both market and affordable housing, the latter which has not been delivered in the village for a number of years; land and parking for a village hall, parking for the school, school drop off area, open space and biodiversity net gain improvements. Amend 4.20 to say "constitutes one of the exceptional circumstances for the use of"

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Note Appendix E plan says 12 affordable (that's 25%). C2 text should be clear the allocation is for 47 residential units, including 14 affordable (30% = CCC policy compliant). Supporting text could be added to confirm this complies with the CCC Local Plan. 14 affordable units will meet the full need (11no.) identified in the 2017 survey, plus to meet further needs which may have arisen since (and the Canterbury Register for people in need of housing. The policy text for the allocation could be set out more clearly, perhaps in bullets: - 47 dwellings (including 14 affordable 30%) - Playing pitches - Land for village hall with parking - School car parking, and pedestrian access to school - Open space

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Text in the box appears to have been cropped – is there meant to be a 4th paragraph for the policy?

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

The proposed allocation per Policy C2 will enhance the Recreation Ground, not only retaining the existing level of recreation provision, but enhanced through additional land, along with other areas of open space. This will be retained for the long term achieving the purposes of Policy D1. There may be opportunities to enhance the public right of way crossing the Recreation Ground.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

see 2a above

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Amend para 6.5 to read “so great that no residential development will be...” This then aligns with the wording in Policy E1 which states it applies to residential development.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

see 1a above

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Cantley Ltd is the landowner which owns land north of Bridge and towards Canterbury. The NP shows there are no proposals for development in this location thereby safeguarding the openness and separation between Bridge and Canterbury for the plan period. Para 6.10 which states the PC "will continue to object to unwanted development in the AONB on the south side of Canterbury..." can be deleted as this is not necessary to state here.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

see 2a

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

see 3a

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Please provide your:**

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Name: * | Stuart Garnett |
| Business or organisation name (if applicable): | on behalf of Cantley Ltd |
| Address: * | [Redacted] |
| Postcode: * | [Redacted] |
| Email address: | [Redacted] |
| Telephone number: | [Redacted] |

☒ Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☐ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***
Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

Complete support and total respect for the rural village of Bridge to research and develop this neighborhood plan. We must all, including the Canterbury City Council, work together to plan for future needs while preserving local control of rural villages in this Council area. Fat cat developers appear to have run roughshod over Canterbury Council in the past few years. New housing developments have been built without any new schools, medical practices, pharmacies or other necessary institutions to support all of these newly relocated families. It is appalling. Kudos for Bridge Parish Council for being proactive and attempting to maintain control over their beautiful village. It is in everyone's best interest to understand the supreme importance of maintaining the UK's rural village communities.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Christine Collins

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number:



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. Do you have any other comments on the plan's overall vision? If so, please write in below

As this Plan will shape the development within the Village for the next 15 years, it does require that some view is given to the required level of domestic housing required for a reasonable, natural, growth of the Village. The level of additional housing set is below that suggested by the District, and the Plan perhaps might have shown how this slightly reduced level would help protect existing business (hospitality/Post Office etc services/local shops/etc). The need to trade off some space at the Recreation Ground in exchange for eternal control and ownership of the remainder has been well set out, and the fact that this is an acceptable exception regarding use of AONB land. Perhaps more might have been said as to the relative quality of the AONB land used: a reasonable case should have been made for re-designating the land west of the raised viaduct when the A2 by-pass was created, for it spoiled the value of the 'orphaned' land that will now be put to good use if this Plan is adopted.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
- * Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
- Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐ Strongly agree
 - ☐ Tend to agree
 - ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 - ☐ Tend to disagree
 - ☐ Strongly disagree
 - ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐ Strongly agree
 - ☐ Tend to agree
 - ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 - ☐ Tend to disagree
 - ☐ Strongly disagree
 - ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Some additional housing can reasonably be expected for the Village, over the forthcoming 15 years. This policy sets out where, and to what standards, and sets an outside limit as to quantum, and frees most of the Village from building blight by specifying where any new building will occur.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

It sets out the proper standards expected of development within the Village.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The Plan attempts to set out a proper zoning for the additional housing, and for the recreational and social assets for the Village for the near future. The Recreation Ground will thereby be preserved for the Village and in itself will be a major success of the Plan.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

Flooding experienced within Bridge is a terrible thing and the Village deserves the best possible water and sewerage services and new properties must be safeguarded from such horrors. The Plan is correct to remind Planners and Planning Committee members that the Village is a potential flood zone and that they must have due regard to this factor when development is applied for and considered.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

The Village needs its own recreational and Social assets to allow the local residents, in a time when car travel is frowned upon or becoming increasingly more expensive, and public transport is being reduced or withdrawn, to have have a range of assets nearby.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

The qualification come only because it has to be acknowledged that space is finite, and, as allowed for within the NPPF itself, there will have to be some land used to create the the additional Village Hall facility mentioned within the Plan. Of course, that Hall will, in turn, allow other recreational facilities to become available.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☒ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

A KCC matter really, but it is hoped that local residents will be given some priority, which in turn will reduce the number of car trips into the Village at school times, for the new local residents will take places instead of school children travelling in from Canterbury etc.

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

A series of small policies that will preserve the Village identity.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Ever stood in a flooded out front room??

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Preserves the separate identity of the Village

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

This policy is important because the only housing otherwise set out provides tangible benefits for the Village. This policy prevents other development, other than where a significant benefit can be offered, allowing a measure of reasonableness, yet underlining the point that the Village will not be built over nor will it suffer random building blight at the whim of those that do not live within the Village.

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

This is to assist to preserve the quiet Village profile that exists.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

Absolutely: preserve the village identity.

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

The allotments are currently hugely oversubscribed and trhis is a village asset that we should retain.

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

A great deal of work has clearly been put into this Plan, and it seeks to obtain measured development for the Village over the next 15 years and more within this Village. Some trade-off has been considered and written into the Plan, by those that live within the Village, and the Plan should now be supported and used as a development document for the Village for the future.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Alan Atkinson

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☒ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☒ Objective A
- ☒ Objective B
- ☒ Objective C
- ☒ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☒ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

This plan recognises a number of challenges facing the village both now and in the future. It provides a way forward that recognises those challenges - retaining what is valued while recognising the need for growth and change within a historic village environment.

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

- 1a. Why? Please write in below
- As already stated

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

- 2a. Why? Please write in below
- As stated

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

A post office is an essential element of the village providing not just postal services but also access to banking.

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

1a. **Why?** Please write in below

Many villagers rely on public transport for access to school, work, shopping and other activities outside the village.

left characters remaining

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Why?** Please write in below

Safe cycling for those who can cycle.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

Parking is a significant problem, this takes it into account on future developments

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

Definitely. It would make the High Street much safer.

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

Well used by residents and needed.

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

Existing parking is a challenge.

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

Seems to cover all aspects at this time.

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

All possible sites around the village have been explored for development and this site appears to have least impact visually on the historic buildings in the village and provides opportunities for the village hall and off-road parking. Transfer of the recreation ground to the parish council must be an integral part of this approach.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

It is vital that new developments help to mitigate the risk of flood and in no way contribute any risk of flooding, including surface water flooding.

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

This must not be eroded.

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

- 1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

It is important Bridge retains its character as a village as it develops and responds to impact of environmental changes and changing needs of the community.

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * C Wortham

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * [REDACTED]

Postcode: * [REDACTED]

Email address:

Telephone number:



Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged

Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 16

Bridge Parish Council has prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan for the parish and we want to hear your views.

This is an important stage of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan as the comments you make now will be sent to an independent examiner who will examine the plan.

Information about the Neighbourhood Plan process and its key stages can be found at

Please note that comments received cannot be treated as confidential as the council is required to submit them to the examiner and make them public.

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. **Which part/s of the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan would you like to comment on? *** Please tick all that apply

(Please note that as the plan's policies and projects are related to each Objective, questions on these correspond and can be found under each Objective)

- ☐ Objective A
- ☐ Objective B
- ☐ Objective C
- ☐ Objective D
- ☒ Objective E
- ☐ Objective F

2. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the plan's overall vision? *** Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

2a. **Do you have any other comments on the plan’s overall vision?** If so, please write in below

Agree with the limited housing, as well as a safe cycle path from Bridge to Canterbury

left characters remaining

Objective A

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective A?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy A1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project A2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective B

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective B?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B1? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B2? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B3? ***
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project B5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective C

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective C?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy C3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective D

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective D?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy D1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D1?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project D2?**

* Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective E

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective E?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☒

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

Add local farmland to important Green spaces; in particular in the ‘Map of Important Green Spaces’, south east of the area of land marked 1, south east of the area marked 6, and west of the area marked 2. This land, other than being important farmland, brings walkers to the area and is thus an important tourist attraction.

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☒

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

4. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E3? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

4a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

5. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E4? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

5a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy E5? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

6a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E1? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

7a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Project E2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

8a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Objective F

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Objective F?
* Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

1a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F1? *
Please tick one box only
- ☐

 Strongly agree
- ☐

 Tend to agree
- ☐

 Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐

 Tend to disagree
- ☐

 Strongly disagree
- ☐

 Don't know

2a. Why? Please write in below

left characters remaining

3. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach set out in Policy F2? ***

Please tick one box only

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Tend to agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Tend to disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Don't know

3a. **Why?** Please write in below

left characters remaining

Any other comments

1. **Do you have any other comments on the Bridge Neighbourhood Plan?** If so, please write in below

left characters remaining

About you

Your personal information is processed under General Data Protection Regulations Article 6.1(c) to meet our duty to receive representations in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Your personal data will be stored in accordance with the council's retention schedule.

Your information will be shared with an Independent Examiner.

You need to provide your name and address otherwise your comments cannot be taken into account.

You have the rights to:

- access your personal data
- rectify or correct your personal data
- restrict the processing of your data
- complain to the Information Commissioner's Office

The appointed Data Protection Officer is Canterbury City Council's Head of Corporate Governance, who can be contacted by email at **dataprotection@canterbury.gov.uk**, by phone on **01227 862 175** or at the address below.

Canterbury City Council, Council Offices, Military Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 1YW.
Phone: **01227 862 000**. Web: **canterbury.gov.uk**

Questions that must be answered are marked with a red asterisk (*)

1. Please provide your:

Name: * Carl Gower

Business or
organisation name (if
applicable):

Address: * 

Postcode: * 

Email address:

Telephone number:

☐

Please tick if you would like to be notified of the next stages of the Neighbourhood Plan following this consultation

Most Neighbourhood Plan examinations do not require a public hearing. However, if the examiner decides to hold a public hearing, please indicate whether or not you would like to participate. They will then inform you if they need you to attend.

- ☐ Yes, I wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged
- ☒ No, I do not wish to participate in a hearing if one is arranged