

Planning and Transportation Policy Working Group	
Meeting Date	27 th May 2026
Report Title	Local Plan Review - Regulation 18 Representations, Summaries and Draft Responses
EMT Lead	Emma Wiggins – Director of Regeneration & Neighbourhoods
Head of Service	Joanne Johnson – Head of Place
Lead Officer	Natalie Earl – Planning Manager (Policy)
Classification	Open
Recommendations	That members note the representations received to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation and the draft responses, and provide comment as appropriate.

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report presents the representations, summaries and draft responses to the recent Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation.
- 1.2 Once the responses are noted, officers will use them to make amendments to the relevant sections and policies before the Regulation 19 Local Plan is brought to members for agreement to go out to consultation.

2 Background, Context and Proposals

- 2.1 Members reviewed the draft Regulation 18 Local Plan at Planning and Transportation Policy Working Group (PTPWG) on 4th November 2025, at Policy and Resources committee (P&R) on 18th November 2025 and it was approved for consultation purposes at Full Council (FC) on 10th December 2025.
- 2.2 The document was out for consultation between Monday 12th January 2026 and Monday 23rd February 2026. The consultation could be viewed and responded to via the Council's consultation portal: <https://swaleconsult.objective.co.uk/kse/>. Alternatively, comments could be submitted by email or post.
- 2.3 The comments that were received have now been made viewable on the consultation portal so that all stakeholders can see all of the comments received. They can be viewed at [Local Plan Review \(Regulation 18\), January 2026 - What people say - Keyplan](#)

- 2.4 Officers have summarised the representations and drafted responses to all of the comments received. These were made viewable on the portal alongside the publishing of the working group papers. Only those representations where officers propose making changes in response are set out in Appendix I of this report. All of the summaries and draft responses which don't propose a change are available to view on the Objective portal. A guide on how to do this is set out in Appendix II.
- 2.5 The number and complexity of the representations received was greater than expected and therefore the summaries and responses in Appendix I may require further work in terms of formatting and spelling, etc before the Council submits all the background information to the Planning Inspectorate at the end of the year.
- 2.6 As set out in the PTPWG report on 12th March 2026, the representations received covered a wide range of topics and themes. Whilst many comments will help positively shape the Reg 19 consultation draft, none were considered to be 'showstoppers.' The table below provides a flavour of the main issues arising and feedback given under the different topics areas.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
General Comments	• How will the policies be reviewed/amended when the new NPPF is published? • Retaining right to comment further until whole Local Plan is produced, including wanting more information on strategic policies, site allocations and proposals maps and limited value of only DM policies. • Ensure the key elements of the evidence base it as up to date as possible and ready for Regulation 19. • Some evidence is becoming dated. • Conflict between Plan approach on DM policies that may affect windfall sites and what happens at the planning application stage. For example, the policies on agricultural and important Local Countryside gaps need more flexibility. • Praise for the consultation approach and availability of documents. • Site promoters resubmitted their potential site which have already gone through the HELAA process.
Opening Chapters	• Comments on the ambitious timetable to submit a Local Plan by December 2026. • Some suggestions that the Reg 19 consultation period should be extended beyond six weeks, due to it being over the summer holiday period. • Comments setting out the history of the Local Plan review. • No identified housing requirement – therefore the plan cannot demonstrate how future needs will be addressed.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	• Absence of a spatial strategy – and it doesn't allocate land or identify locations for new housing, • Recognition of the delays caused by the Highsted Park inquiry extension. • No housing trajectory or housing supply position. • Concerned that it is not realistic or procedurally sound to progress directly to a Regulation 19 without an intermediate consultation stage covering spatial strategy and site allocations. • Cross boundary and inter-authority issues need to be set out. • The section appropriately sets out what has influenced the plan and references are noted. It also recognises what underpins the local plan. • The absence of Spatial Strategy and not setting out preferred option cuts out interested parties from consultation stage as they have no opportunity to comment.
Key Issues and Challenges	• Broad support for the issues and challenges as set out. • Housing and transport are the key issues which affect the lives of most residents. • The main issues and challenges raised were access to health facilities, schools and water supply. • Culture should be added as a key issue (in terms of importance and identity). • Affordable housing is a key challenge and issue. The Council's acknowledgement that the shortfall in affordable housing represents one of the principal challenges of the draft Plan is welcomed. • Welcome the high priority given to active travel.
Vision	• Broadly supported. • Some criticism that it is unrealistic. • Term "Government imposed targets" is not positive. • Greater detail requested on local areas, especially by Parish Councils in rural areas. • Provide specifics on environmental issues and how the Plan will deliver environmental enhancement. • Greater detail on infrastructure provision is needed.
Objectives	• Broad support. • Request considerable detail on specifics within objectives. • Concern that environmental, climate change and landscape objectives have been watered down.
Policy G1 – General	• General support for this policy. • Further suggestions were made for inclusion to strengthen the policy, namely; greenspace, active travel, design codes,

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
Development Criteria	carbon reduction, countryside gaps, infrastructure, services, BMV, national landscapes and Neighbourhood Plans. • Developers expressed concern over the TCPA Healthy Homes Principles and requested that its scope was reduced to ensure it only meets the valid planning objectives within it.
Design	
Policy GD1 – Local Design Principles	• No reference to Neighbourhood Plans - should be signposted as NPs often have more detailed locally specific design principles. • Support the preamble. • Supports the strong emphasis on high quality design, local distinctiveness and place-making. • The recognition that good design contributes to civic pride, economic vitality and environmental quality is welcomed. • The reference to national guidance, Design Codes and the use of Design Review Panels is supported, particularly for developments of significant scale or sensitivity. • Its effectiveness is undermined by its length and the breadth of the criteria. The policy is not easy to read or interpret. • Overly prescriptive text.
Policy GD2 – Alterations and Extensions	• Sensitive alterations and extensions must respect the character and setting of existing buildings. • The preamble appropriately recognises that alterations, extensions and conversions can extend the life of buildings and respond to changing needs, whilst also acknowledging the potential for harm where such changes are poorly designed or overly concentrated. • The emphasis on responding positively to the style, scale and character of the existing building, preserving features of interest, reinforcing local distinctiveness and safeguarding residential amenity is welcomed. • Respondents sought greater emphasis on neighbourhood plans, local needs, and Parish Council input. • Concerns raised that existing SPD/guidance is outdated.
Policy GD3 – Shop Fronts, Signs and Advertisements	• Welcome the clear statement that development proposals that remove, replace or substantially harm shop-fronts of historic interest will not be supported. • The policy could reverse incremental harm and this is strongly supported. • Agree that the design of shop front signs and advertisements have a major influence on an area's appearance, in particular in conservation areas or on Listed Buildings. business.
Housing	

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
Policy H1 - Affordable Housing	• Broadly supported. • Questions on accuracy of viability including the need for an update for Reg 19. • More flexibility on tenure and housing mix requested where viability is challenging. • Some preference for existing Local Plan Bearing Fruits approach as higher levels are sought in more viable areas and would result in loss of needed affordable housing. • Housing SPD will no longer be a planning consideration. How will alternative guidance be presented? • Policy is needed to help with affordable housing need in the borough.
Policy H2 - Small and medium sites for housing development	• Broadly supported. • Ensure policy compliant requirement of sites identified as small and medium as set out in NPPF and draft NPPF. • More flexibility on considering windfall sites for the type of development. • More flexibility on tenure requirement as viability could be an issue. • Viability is challenging for SMEs. • Sites maybe subdivided and then sold on after outline consent and so these types of site should be open to other types of developer looking to support SME.
Policy H3 - Rural exception and community-led housing development	• Broadly supported. • Questions on appropriateness of affordable housing on sites of this nature. • Need for these types of schemes in rural areas. • Meet local needs including sustaining communities.
Policy H4 – Self-Build and Custom Build	• Policy could create an overprovision. • Locating self builds within a development disregards the underpinning of self-build and custom house building because they are usually in rural areas where there are less restrictions on design. • Comments suggesting a marketing period.
Policy - H5 Park Homes	• Broadly supported. • Should be considered for all age ranges not just older persons. • Could make contribution to all housing needs including affordable. • Should consider naming the policy residential mobile homes/caravans to make clear type of accommodation. • Ensure site is properly managed for the purposes of the policy. • Council over reliant on windfalls to meet the needs of the borough.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
Policy H6 – Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation	• Support for the criteria-based policy, rather than an intention to allocate land to accommodate a longer-term need for pitches. • Pleased to see recognition that there may be circumstances where need arises for the provision of affordable Gypsy and Traveller pitches, as well as bricks and mortar affordable housing.
Policy H7 - Dwellings for rural workers	• Broadly supported. • Ensure the need is evidenced. • Ensure the policy is enforceable and that property is retained in perpetuity for rural use.
Policy H8 - Extensions to, & the replacement of, dwellings in the countryside	• Broadly supported. • Seeking criteria that would duplicate other policies, particularly on design and environment and landscape constraints. • Reiterating building regs for rainwater runoff into fowl sewer.
Policy H9 - Extending the garden of a dwelling in the countryside	• Broadly support. • Concern on cumulative impact from all garden extensions in an area. • Seeking criteria that would duplicate other policies particularly on design and environment and landscape constraints. • Local context for example matters specific to an area of the borough.
Economic Development	
Policy E1 – Loss of Employment Floorspace and Land	• Support for the policy as it protects existing employment across the borough and supports diversification for rural business and enterprise, including for locally grown food production. • Supports the strong presumption in favour of retaining employment land and premises. Protecting employment floorspace is essential to maintaining a resilient local economy, supporting local jobs and reducing the need for out-commuting. • The requirement for robust marketing evidence prior to the release of employment land is welcomed, as is the cautious approach toward mid-plan release of allocated sites. • Marketing a property to prove lack of demand or unsuitability is not always the best or feasible approach. Reliance on professional RICS opinion should also be accepted particularly in the case where no employment activity has existed on the site and the landowner has no intention of providing. • The proposed marketing requirements to justify the loss of employment sites and allocations is excessive.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
Policy E2 – The Rural Economy	• A mixture of support and objection to this policy. • The policy attempts to override permitted development rights for change of use of rural buildings to other uses and is not in compliance with national policy. • The policy is too restrictive and does not allow for other forms of new employment land to come forward in rural areas that can make valuable contributions to the rural economy. • Supports the Council's ambition to encourage the sustainable growth of rural businesses and enterprise. • Is concerned about the requirement for a minimum six month period of extensive, proactive marketing before residential development will be permitted.
Policy E3 – Proposals for Main Town Centre Uses	• While flexibility in use classes is supported, additional reference to encouraging community-based uses (such as health services, small business hubs, cultural or heritage facilities) within both town centres and rural service centres would improve resilience and vitality. • The requirement for impact assessments for out-of-centre retail proposals is welcomed. It would be helpful to emphasise the need to consider cumulative impacts not only on principal town centres but also on smaller urban and rural local centres. • Supports the policy as it aims to strengthen town centres and direct main town centre uses to appropriate locations in accordance with the retail hierarchy. • Notes that Faversham is identified as a secondary town centre in the hierarchy, matching the Faversham Neighbourhood Plan policy 'FAV1 Faversham Town Centre' which includes a clearly defined area and seeks to support the viability and vitality of the diverse town centre offer. • States that Swale has supported business movement away from the town centres and high streets which has led to town centres on Sheppey not being supported through planning and other work covered by the local plan in the past. • Parking should be free in town centres and business rates lower.
Policy E4 - New Holiday Parks or extensions to existing parks & the occupancy of holiday parks	• Broadly support. • Ensure definitions of caravans is correct. • Sites could contribute more to development needs by being mixed use not just park homes but including bricks and mortar, more flexibility on what could be developed. • Will existing holiday parks have policy retention set out in Local Plan Bearing Fruits.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	- Local context for example matters specific to an area of the borough. - Seasonal local issues on the Isle of Sheppey. - Make sure policy is enforceable particularly on months of occupation.
Infrastructure	
Policy INF1 - Managing Transport Demand & Impact	- Policy is laudable for prioritising sustainable transport. - Current congestion issues. - Existing travel plan initiatives have not produced desired outcome. - Infrastructure should be in place before development. - Concerns for wildlife when roads are built.
Policy INF2 - Vehicle Parking	- Broadly supported. - Why do Swale parking standard differ from KCC? - What are Swale's parking standards? - Swale Parking Standards SPD is quite old. - Local area specific parking problems matters. - Limit increase of on street parking. - Ensure delivery of EV charging points. - Dedicated parking for houses.
Policy INF3 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision	- Council's continued commitment to provide, protect and enhance areas of open space across the borough is welcomed. - Relies on out-of-date documents. - There should also be a policy that covers the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). - Support for emphasis on multi-functional green and blue infrastructure. - Increased requirements have implications for site capacity and housing delivery. - Allowance for the pooling of offsite contributions as an alternative to onsite delivery would be welcomed.
Policy INF4 Local Green Spaces	- Allotment should have their own policy. - No reference to LNRS. - LGS 119 no longer meets the requirements of paragraph 106 of the NPPF. - Welcomes the inclusion of the policy. - De-designation does not need to be justified by reference to exceptional circumstances.
Climate Change, Pollution and the Water Environment	
	The Council is to be particularly commended for this ambitious suite of environmental policies.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	• Whilst recommending improvement, Natural England either 'supports' or 'strongly supports' the policies that it commented on. • Generally, comments on these policies can be split into two broad camps. • The majority of developers argued that the policies in this section (in particular the requirements for overheating assessments, the use of energy metrics (as opposed to the approaches used within Building Regulations), thresholds for post-occupancy evaluation, embodied carbon reporting, heat networks and water efficiency standard of 100litres/person/day, reference to 20% Biodiversity Net Gain) are considered unsound as unviable and not in conformity with the December 2025 draft NPPF which seeks to limit the number of standards that local plans can set. Some parish councils and neighbouring authorities also argued that some policy requirements, whilst desirable, may be unviable. • Others (including most individual responders, most parish councils and community groups) recognised the climate emergency and generally supported the policies as set out or argued that they should be more stringent and made more locally specific and relatable. • The statutory agencies (the Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England) broadly supported the policies and offered comments to strengthen them. Kent County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) and Southern Water (as the wastewater provider and one of the water supply providers to the borough) offered support for elements of the policies and made extensive comments with regard to amendments, particularly to policies C9 Sustainable Drainage and C10 Water Quality and Water Resources. South East Water did not comment on these policies. • The issue of adequate water supply and wastewater capacity was a significant one, which reflects the public concern around this subject. The importance of local chalk streams was raised as well as the need for policy to more closely reflect national standards for sustainable drainage. • The reference on dark skies should be strengthened.
Biodiversity and Landscapes	
Policy B1 Biodiversity & Geodiversity Conservation & BNG	• Integration with the LNRS. • Support for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on new development.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	- Concerns about requirement to achieve a 20% biodiversity net gain and impact on viability and lack of evidence and consideration for draft NPPF. - Policy doesn't go far enough in the protection of locally designated sites.
Policy B2 Conserving & Enhancing Valued Landscapes	- New duty to "seek to further" the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area. - Strong agreement that the borough's landscapes, rural character and tranquillity must be protected and enhanced. - Tranquillity and dark skies should have its own policy. - More restrictive approach to landscape protection than the adopted Policy DM24.
Policy B3 Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan	- Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 imposes a strengthened duty to 'seek to further' the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of National Landscapes. - Incorporate tranquillity as a material consideration.
Policy B4 - The separation of settlements - Important Local Countryside Gaps	- Mixed support (community support could go further – developer objections as too restrictive.) - Policy does not align with anything specific in the NPPF. - Too much weight applied to the policy in the HELAA. - Too restrictive on windfall development when there is not a 5 year housing land supply. - The whole of the land between Faversham and Boughton should be a gap. - Need to consider statutory body infrastructure needs that could occur in gaps and the requirement to release land for those needs.
Policy B5 – Woodland, Orchards, Trees and Hedgerows	- Broadly supported. - Seeking 50m buffer around trees as a minimum rather than 15m in national guidance. - Misunderstanding between the value of orchards in terms of the impacts on climate change and character as set out in policy and their grading between modern and ancient orchard conservation. - None of these assets should be lost in any circumstance. - Support these assets outside of any development impact. - Restrictive approach that replacing trees through development should be only native species rather than the policy's slightly more flexible approach of preferably native. - Seeking "doubling up" of criteria from other policies in the local plan.
Policy B6 - Agricultural Land	Mixed support (community support could go further – developer objections as too restrictive.)

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	• No development on agricultural land as it's a key resource that needs to be protected; including no allocated sites. • Too restrictive on windfall development when there is not a 5 year housing land supply and other higher level policy constraints. • Site area assessment threshold should be raised to 5ha as 1ha is too restrictive.
Policy B7 – The Coast	• Broad support. • It includes many special landscape features and rural characteristics. • Supports the objectives of the policy to appropriately control development on the large area of coastline. • Welcome the inclusion of information on England Coast Path, now known as the King Charles III England Coast Path. • Re-assess damage by pollutants as well as the need for Nutrient Neutrality action. • No significant adverse effects on the Port's operations and area should be allowed and it must be protected for future expansion of industrial and employment use.
Policy B8 – Rural Lanes	• Development that affects rural lanes during or post-construction should be considered in the application. • Outdated Evidence. • Stronger reference to traffic impact, protection of tranquillity and PROW. • Policy should be omitted.
Policy B9 – Keeping & Grazing of horses	• General support for this policy. • Concerns were raised over cumulative impacts on landscapes and protecting the agricultural landscape character. • Links to biodiversity and landscape policies were suggested, as well as reference to groundwater zones.
Historic Environment	
Policy HE1 – Development Involving a Listed Building	• Support for the preamble, which provides a clear and well-reasoned statement of policy on development involving Listed Buildings. • Listed Buildings should be protected against internal division into HMO housing, where historic features are removed. • Appropriate weight should be given to an asset's longevity and potential lifespan. Modest heritage assets accumulate historical and cultural significance over time, and this compounding value should be properly considered in the planning process.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	• Supports the strong emphasis on protecting and enhancing Listed Buildings as irreplaceable heritage assets. • Clearer alignment required with national policy and more precise wording. • Greater emphasis on treatment of cumulative change required. • Clearer requirements like heritage statements and impact assessments required.
Policy HE2 – Development Affecting a Conservation Area	• General support. • To make the preamble more focused and relatable have a stronger emphasis on local identity. • The preamble could more clearly reference the importance of Conservation Areas in maintaining village identity and historic character and their role in supporting tourism and local pride. • For rural Conservation Areas especially, the preamble could more explicitly reference the importance of countryside setting, key views into and out of the area and the relationship between historic buildings and surrounding farmland or open space. • It seeks additional burdens to developers, that are not in line with the NPPF.
Policy HE3 – Parks and Gardens	• Agrees with the preamble and supports the recognition and protection of historic parks and gardens within the borough. • Suggestions to improve the focus and relatability.
Policy HE4 – Non-designated Heritage Assets	• Provides a clear description of and policy approach to Non-designated Heritage Assets. • The preamble should acknowledge the significant variation in heritage value within this category. • Incorporate local heritage and culture into the policy. • Support the positive wording of the policy to seek to retain and conserve these assets. • It is important that any local list is reviewed regularly for completeness and accuracy.
Policy HE5 - Archaeology	• Welcomes the requirement for community involvement in clause 4 of 'Policy HE5 Archaeological heritage'. Their involvement at the earliest stages of planning and design could lead to better outcomes for archaeology and its documentation, understanding and knowledge of assets. • To improve focus and relatability, the preamble would benefit from clearer connections to community identity, vulnerability of assets (particularly coastal and aviation heritage), and the educational and wellbeing value of archaeology to residents today.

Topic Area/Policy	Summary of Feedback From Representations Received
	• It is treating archaeology as just something that is buried. It would be more useful to use the terms like 'heritage asset' rather than 'archaeology' and 'evaluation' and 'mitigation' rather than 'archaeological fieldwork.' • Add reference to local and specific examples within the borough.

Table I: Main issues arising and feedback given to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

Equalities Questions

- 2.7 The equalities survey that sat alongside the consultation was optional and 21 people responded. Nine females and eleven males responded with one respondent preferring not to say. The two most selected age groups by respondents were 65 - 74 and 75 - 84 with five each while the least selected was the 25 - 34 and 45 - 54 age groups with two in each. Three respondents selected yes to the question asking if they had a disability with another three selecting prefer not to say. In the Ethnic Origin category 20 respondents selected the White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish/ British category and one respondent selected the prefer not to say option. These results will feed into the Equalities Impact Assessment as the Council continues to fulfil its equalities duties through the plan making process.

Next Steps

- 2.8 As set out above in paragraph 1.2, once the draft responses are noted, officers will make amendments to the relevant sections and policies before the Regulation 19 Local Plan is brought to members for agreement to go out to consultation.

3 Recommendations

- 3.1 That members note the representations received to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation and the draft responses and provide comment as appropriate.

4 Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- 4.1 The alternative option is for members not to note the responses received, however, a key component of the Local Plan process is that all representations received are considered by the Council. Members could also choose not to note the draft responses. This option is not recommended because officers need to use the responses to amend policies and sections with the emerging Local Plan so that the Regulation 19 is ready for consultation. Members are invited to provide comment on the draft responses.

5 Consultation Undertaken or Proposed

5.1 A consultation strategy on the Regulation 18 Local Plan, in line with the recently adopted Statement of Community Involvement, was implemented including:

- Emails sent out setting out the forthcoming dates to those on the Council's Local Plan consultation database ahead of the start of the consultation;
- Officers attended two Swale Local Parish Council Liaison Forum meetings – one ahead of the consultation launch to allow any additional meetings to be programmed by the Town and Parish Councils and one during the consultation to allow Parish and Town Councillors to raise any questions with officers that they may have had on the document;
- Printed copies of the documents were placed at all of Swale's libraries, including the mobile ones, and at The Swallows Leisure Centre, Sittingbourne whilst Sittingbourne library was shut for refurbishment. They were also provided with posters to display advertising the consultation;
- For the first time the team produced a video explaining the consultation document, what a Local Plan is and how to get involved with the consultation. The team have received positive feedback on the video;
- Emails were sent to Swale's Green Grid contacts;
- An article was included in the Swale Means Business newsletter;
- An article was included in the new resident newsletter and in Inside Swale;
- Posters were made available to Parish and Town Councils and were available to download from Swale's website for other community groups to share;
- The communications team shared regular social media posts promoting the consultation;
- Regular email reminders were sent throughout the consultation period to those on the database;
- The team produced Regulation 18 Frequently Asked Questions to assist stakeholders; and
- The documents were available to read on the Objective portal or could be downloaded and printed, or a copy could be purchased.

6 Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	The Local Plan supports the delivery of the Corporate Plan, aligning with the following priorities: • Environment - To provide a cleaner, healthier, more sustainable and enjoyable environment, and to prepare our borough for the challenges ahead. • Community - To enable our residents to live, work and enjoy their leisure time safely in our borough and to support community resilience.

	• Economy – Working with our businesses and community organisations to work towards a sustainable economy which delivers for local people. • Health and Housing - To aspire to be a borough where everyone has access to a decent home and improved health and wellbeing. The Corporate Plan contains a specific objective to ‘progress a Local Plan with local needs and capacity at its heart.’
Financial, Resource and Property	The Local Plan work programme is fully funded across a combination of base budget, committed reserves and a contribution from the government’s Local Plans Delivery Fund.
Legal, Statutory and Procurement	Preparation of a Local Plan is carried out under a national legislative and regulatory framework.
Crime and Disorder	There are no direct crime and disorder impacts arising from this decision.
Environment and Climate/Ecological Emergency	As part of the Local Plan, there will be a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment at each key stage in decision making and these assess the environmental impact of the Local Plan as a whole.
Health and Wellbeing	No implications identified at this stage.
Safeguarding of Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults	No implications identified at this stage.
Risk Management and Health and Safety	No implications identified at this stage.
Equality and Diversity	No implications identified at this stage.
Privacy and Data Protection	No implications identified at this stage.
Local Government Reorganisation	The current Local Plan timetable expects the Local Plan to be submitted for its Examination in Public and to be adopted before local government reorganisation is expected to be complete.

7 Appendices

7.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation (where changes are proposed.)

- Appendix II: A guide to viewing representations, summaries and draft responses on Objective portal (where changes are not proposed.)

8 Background Papers

- 8.1 PTPWG Report - High Level Early Feedback on the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation