

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/58	1	Question 001 Do you have any comments on section 1 of the draft Local Plan which will inform the Plan's progression?				Hernhill Parish Council			It should be made clear that the NPPF Dec 2025 will have an effect on this plan.		
2026Reg18/131	2	Question 003 Have all the key issues and challenges been taken into consideration?				Environm ent Agency		.	We note that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will next be published alongside the Regulation 19 Local Plan. We are interested in having early conversations regarding the Medway Estuary and Swale Strategy and the role of Strategic Flood defences in the plan. We also note that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will be published before the Regulation 19 consultation. We would like to highlight the importance of the SFRA in informing the policies and site allocations within the plan. Especially as the SFRA provides the basis for applying the Sequential Test, which should be done at the earliest possible stage of the plan-making process. For paragraph 3.2.15 we suggest flood defences are also listed within the physical infrastructure category, as this is likely to be required within the IDP. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.63 PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT		
2026Reg18/31	57	Question 003 Have all the key issues and challenges been taken into consideration?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent	CPRE campaigns from Parish to Parliament on a range of issues including: prioritising genuinely affordable homegiving the principle of 'brownfield-first' development some teethprotecting best and most versatile agricultural land (food security); andprotecting our landscapes as we transition to (rooftop) renewables. Accordingly, we recognise and support in principle the identification of the key issues and challenges facing the Council. In terms of infrastructure delivery our members and supporters consistently ask that infrastructure be provided up-front, in order that existing communities are not prejudiced in terms of the demands placed on existing services and facilities by new residents. With regard to affordable housing, we would like to see every effort made to hold developers to account in securing the provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy H1. It often seems to be the case that once planning permission has been granted developers seek to renegotiate what they've previously committed to. In addition to the issues and challenges identified, we would like to see details with regard to delivery rates (from nationwide and SME builders) to enable a better understanding of the rate at which allocated (and windfall) sites are being built out. We would like to see paragraph 3.2.19 amended to make reference to the use of Community Infrastructure Levy payments, and if not, an explanation given as to the reasons why reliance is placed instead on Section 106 Agreements. Having a non-negotiable standardised levy would avoid the issue of developers seeking to renegotiate S.106 Agreements. Reference is made at paragraph 3.2.51 to the cost implications of CIL and the impact this would have on the whole plan viability, when the Council doesn't actually have a current CIL scheme. This needs to be corrected.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/58	The respondent stats that it should be made clear that the NPPF Dec 2025 will have an effect on this plan.	Once the NPPF is adopted, the Local Plan will be updated to reflect any changes in national policy. The Reg 19 will include a sentence on the current status of the NPPF. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/131	Note IDP will be published with Local Plan. Would like to have discussions regarding Medway Estuary and Swale Strategy and the role of Strategic Flood defences. Note SFRA will be published ahead of Regulation 19 consultation. SFRA should inform policies and allocations and is basis for Sequential Test, which should be done at earliest stage of plan making. Seeks amendment to add flood defences to paragraph 3.2.15 in physical infrastructure.	Swale Borough Council has regular meetings with the MEASS team regarding the MEAS strategy and role of flood defences and this has led to formulation of Policy C7. These discussions will continue as the Regulation 19 document is produced. SBC would be happy to meet with EA officers to inform the preparation of the IDP. The SFRA is being produced alongside the Local Plan and is feeding into the site selection process and being used to inform the Sequential Test. The Council agrees to add flood defences to paragraph 3.2.15 with the physical infrastructure category. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/31	The respondent recognises and supports in principle the identification of the key issues and challenges facing the Council. Ask that infrastructure be provided up-front. Would like to see every effort made to hold developers to account in securing the provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy. Would like to see details with regard to delivery rates (from nationwide and SME builders) to enable a better understanding of the rate at which allocated (and windfall) sites are being built out. Requests paragraph 3.2.19 be amended to make reference to the use of Community Infrastructure Levy payments. States that reference is made at paragraph 3.2.51 to the cost implications of CIL and the impact this would have on the whole plan viability, when the Council doesn't have a current CIL scheme.	Noted. The Local Plan assesses the impacts of proposed development, including on the transport network, schools and health services. The Council works in partnership with those organisations responsible for these services to ensure that they are accounted for and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which sits alongside the Local Plan sets out all of the required infrastructure needs. The phasing of infrastructure is set out in the IDP. Noted. This would be too detailed for the Local Plan and would be set out in the evidence base documents such as the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and the Housing Market Assessment. Paragraph 3.2.19 will be amended to make reference to the use of Community Infrastructure Levy payments. Change Agreed. This paragraph is talking about viability generally rather than in Swale. Partial Change Agreed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/33	19	Question 003 Have all the key issues and challenges been taken into consideration?				Queenbor ough Town Council	Town	Clerk	3.1.2 Queenborough would not be considered for good rail links when trains only run one every hour and after midnight you cannot travel to from the mainland by train. Often resulting in people stranded at mainland train stations with no way back by train to the Isle of Sheppey. 3.1.11 There is disagreement with these figures for Sheerness can this be reviewed and it is expected to be higher. 3.2.2 Support town centres making parking free and business rates lower, consider extending the one-year free rate to 75%, 50% and 25% over the following years to support the building of businesses in this time. 3.2.15 All Infrastructure should be key and in place before any new homes are built in Swale 3.2.16 The emphasis on transport/issues and infrastructure raise concerns about the impact development on the lack of infrastructure on the Isle of Sheppey, for highways, lack of school places, health services etc. 3.2.19 The emphasis on transport/issues and infrastructure raise concerns about the impact development on the lack of infrastructure on the Isle of Sheppey, for highways, lack of school places, health services etc. 3.2.20		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/33	Disagree with para 3.1.2 as Queenborough would not be considered for good rail links. State that the figures for Sheerness in para 3.1.11 are incorrect. State that parking should be free in town centres and business rates lower. All Infrastructure should be in place before any new homes are built in Swale Suggests that the Sheppey Light Greenway should be included in paragraph 3.2.29. Notes that Swale is renowned for its bird population around the estuary; therefore, this area should be made a protected area.	Noted. When talking about good rail links in paragraph 3.1.2 it is talking about rail links in all of Swale. The specific mention of Queenborough is just stating that it has a train station. Council colleagues have undertaken surveys for updated vacancy rates within the last month and the updated figure for Sheerness is 8.69% so slightly different. All of the figures in this paragraph will be updated for the Reg 19. This is not a Local Plan issue. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will accompany the Local Plan which will detail all of the required infrastructure and when it needs to be delivered. The Sheppey Light Greenway is in the newly adopted Swale LCWIP but this paragraph is about Kent LCWIP cycle routes which begin/end in Swale which this isn't. This area is a protected area, both nationally and internationally. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/76	3	Question 003 Have all the key issues and challenges been taken into consideration?				Five Parishes Oppositio n Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG commends this section and particularly we value the heritage, ecological, The Swale, North Kent Marshes, The Creeks and other water courses and the Kent Downs National Landscape designations. These are all characteristics of the borough that must be preserved and enhanced by the Local Plan. Paragraph 3.1.1 – mentions that “Swale lies on the North Kent Coast” but there does not seem to be a policy on the “Coastal/Waterways including creeks, streams or other waterways” policy. Medway has commenced a strategy on the River Medway Strategy: https://democracy.medway.gov.uk/mgconvert2pdf.aspx?id&#61;85787 Paragraph 3.1.2 – Is Selling Railway Station in Swale? We think that it is. Paragraph 3.1.3 fails to mention all the ports in Swale including Ridham, Queenborough, Faversham, to the smaller ports of Conyer, Milton, Lower Halstow and Oare. Paragraph 3.1.13 – In table 3.1.3 should there be reference to the National Nature Reserves (NNR), Swale has 3 NNR's.. Is the number of Grade II* listings correct? Does this include Bexon Court which Swale constantly seems to have down as the incorrect listing. Paragraph 3.2.2 – The key issues and challenges are well summarised. However the main issue that is the excessively high residential building target approx 17,000 homes set by Government, on top of the current provision of 64,250 homes in Swale. That's an astonishing 27% increase in stock. There's no mention of the existing appalling shortfall in infrastructure including healthcare provision, education, public transport provision etc. We do not understand how this infrastructure deficit can be made up. Swale must have an “infrastructure first policy” and it must have a model s106 agreement that developers use to draft the s106 and provide on lodging a planning application not on the night of a planning committee or afterwards. We have seen how many mistakes are made in drafting these s106 agreements		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/76	Representation received after the deadline. Commends this section. The rep sets out a number of specific comments: Paragraph 3.1.1 - mentions that "Swale lies on the North Kent Coast" but there does not seem to be a policy on the "Coastal/Waterways including creeks, streams or other waterways." Paragraph 3.1.2 - Selling Railway Station is missing. Paragraph 3.1.3 fails to mention all the ports in Swale including Ridham, Queenborough, Faversham, to the smaller ports of Conyer, Milton, Lower Halstow and Oare. Paragraph 3.1.13 - In table 3.1.3 should there be reference to the National Nature Reserves (NNR), Swale has 3 NNR's.. Is the number of Grade II* listings correct? Does this include Bexon Court? Paragraph 3.2.2 - The key issues and challenges are well summarised. States that the main issue that is the excessively high residential building target set by Government and that there's no mention of the existing shortfall in infrastructure. States that Swale must have an "infrastructure first policy" and it must have a model s106 agreement that developers use to draft the s106 and provide on lodging a planning application not on the night of a planning committee or afterwards. Paragraph 3.2.5 mentions water scarcity and a better policy for protecting the aquifer and water protection zones is required. Sets out that the Local Plan needs to include control mechanisms that ensure the funding and infrastructure agreed is delivered. That mechanism must make sure that the Council has sufficient resources to properly supervise and enforce the delivery of agreements. Describes current infrastructure issues:* Lack of GP Services in Swale, particularly Sittingbourne* No prescribing facility at the Sittingbourne Memorial Hospital* Failure to deliver new secondary school provision to the North of Sittingbourne* Increased pollution events in Milton Creek around the Sittingbourne Waste Treatment Works States that paragraph 3.2.24 mentions Active Travel and the improvements that can be achieved, but this fails when it comes down to individual Planning Applications. Paragraph 3.2.52 mentions the mental health crisis in Swale, but there is no provision from Kent County Council for Mental Health Safe Havens in Swale.	Noted. Noted. The creeks and waterways are covered in a number of policies in the Plan. Most notably, Policy C6 'Costal Change Management', Policy C7 'Implementing the Medway Estuary and Swale Coastal Risk Management Strategy' and Policy B7 'The Coast.' There will also be a Strategic Policy, ST11 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment' in the Reg 19 Local Pln. Selling Railway Station will be added to paragraph 3.1.2. Change Proposed. This paragraph only mentions Sheerness due to it's strategic importance and was not intended as a list of all of Swale's ports. Swale's 3 National Nature Reserves will be added to table 3.1.3. The number of Grade II* listings is correct an includes Bexon Court. Noted. A Local Plan can't deal with an infrastructure deficit, only with the needs arising from development allocated in the Plan itself. The Local Plan assesses the impacts of proposed development, including on the transport network, schools and health services. The Council works in partnership with those organisations responsible for these services to ensure that they are accounted for and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which sits alongside the Local Plan sets out all of the required infrastructure needs. Model s106 agreements for developers to use to draft their s106s are not something for the Local Plan to provide. Policy C10 'Water Quality and Water Resources' addresses these water issues. The Local Plan is not the vehicle to provide a control mechanism to ensure funding and infrastructure agreed is delivered and to ensure the Council has sufficient resources to enforce the delivery of agreements. This is for the planning permission and S106 and wider resourcing discussions within the Council. Noted. The Swale Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan has now been adopted by the Council, so alongside the policies in this Plan, have the weight for officers and members to ensure that active travel is a key component of planning proposals. This section is setting out the challenges for the Local Plan and not the answers. Through partnership working and responses to the Reg 18, this has not been raised as a requirement by KCC. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/105	5	Question 003 Have all the key issues and challenges been taken into consideration?				Creative Estuary			(See attached document) Heritage and Ecological Assets 3.1.14 Swale is the proud home to a range of heritage and ecological designations, as follows: Designation Asset Ramsar (wetlands) Medway Estuary; Swale Estuary and Marshes The Swale; Medway Estuary and Marshes; Sheppey Cliffs and Foreshore; Church Woods; Ellenden Wood; Queendown Warren; Purple Hill. Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Special Area of Conservation Queendown Warren; The Blean complex Swale SPA; Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA; Outer Thames Estuary SPA Special Protection Area Marine Conservation Zone Swale Estuary; Medway Estuary The Medway Estuary; The Swale, Milton Creek, Conyer Creek, Oare Creek, Faversham Creek Rivers and waterways Scheduled Monument 23 Listed Buildings 1,440 (37 Grade I; 93 Grade II*) Conservation Areas 51 Historic Parks and Gardens 4 Table NB. Include the Cultural assets and clusters as assets in the borough. 3.1.33.1.15 Swale includes an extensive stretch of the Kent Downs National Landscape (formerly known as the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).NB. Include paths and transport to support culture and natural landscape tourism development, eco-tourism, and linked to pubs and cafes. 3.2 Key issues and challenges3.2.1 Reviewing the Local Plan provides an opportunity to celebrate the richness of the borough but also to address key challenges. The challenges below have been identified by the evidence compiled and by consultation responses during previous stages of Local Plan development. They may be the subject of complementary documents, such as Swale Borough Council's Corporate Plan, the Climate and Ecological Emergency Declaration, and the Affordable Housing Emergency Declaration. 3.2.2 The key challenges being addressed by this Local Plan Review are: Delivering a net zero carbon borough by 2045; Embedding active travel within new and existing developments to improve air quality, reduce road traffic accidents, reduce congestion and improve overall health and wellbeing; The significant shortfall in the supply of affordable homes leading to a growing		
2026Reg18/59	3	Question 008 Do you support or object to Policy G1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Home Builders Federation	M	Behrendt		Neither	9. It is not clear why this policy is necessary as it just states development must accord with policies in the local plan and then broadly reiterates the requirements of specific policies in the local plan. HBF would recommend it is deleted as it is unnecessary. However, if it is maintained certain elements would need to be deleted as they are unsound. 10. With regard to part 3, the Council should be aware supplementary planning documents and guidance and not planning policy. The Council can state that all development should have regard to supplementary guidance, but it cannot seek to give them the status of a local plan policy. This distinction must be recognised in G1. 11. The Council should delete part 4 which requires a statement demonstrating the degree to which a development meet the TCPAs health homes principles. Development must provide evidence as to how it meets national and local planning policy which have been assessed as being sound. When taken together these policies should ensure that development delivers against both national and local objectives without the need for further state-ments relating to principles put forward by the TCPA.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/105	The respondent requests that cultural assets and clusters are included in the section on Heritage and Ecological Assets in the borough. Suggests including culture as part of the solution of High Street decline - the diversification of the high street is a trend that the cultural sector has led nationally and there are many examples of re-use of empty shops for artists studios and cultural centres. Design and maintenance of high streets should also include consideration and reinvestment in cultural infrastructure, to support cultural events, festivals, and parades.	The Council agrees and will add cultural assets and clusters in the section on Heritage and Ecological Assets in the borough. The Council agrees that culture has a role in revitalising town centres and will add a paragraph into DM Policy E3 'Proposals for Main Town Centre Uses' which sets out this issue. This will be into DM Policy E3 'Proposals for Main Town Centre Uses' which sets out this issue. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/59	1. Recommends that this policy is deleted as it broadly reiterates the requirements of other specific policies contained within the local plan. 2. If the policy is retained, certain elements would need to be deleted as they are unsound. 3. The Council cannot seek to give Supplementary Planning Documents the status of a local plan policy, and this should be recognised in Policy G1. 4. Seeks the deletion of point 4, which refers to the provision of a statement demonstrating the degree to which a development meets the TCPAs Healthy Homes Principles.	1. The Council believes that Policy G1 provides a suitable framework for development and is not to be read in isolation but read in conjunction with all other relevant policies in the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, as a whole. 2. The Council is unclear as to which elements are deemed to be unsound. 3. The Council will seek to differentiate between Planning Policy and SPDs within Policy G1. (Consider "Accord with policies and consider guidance in the Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.") 4. The Council disagrees and seeks to retain that all development proposals will include a statement to demonstrate the degree to which it accords with the TCPA Healthy Homes Principles. This policy is ambitious and aspirational but offers consideration and flexibility within the policy wording 'as appropriate'. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/77	4	Question 008 Do you support or object to Policy G1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Pegasus Group	P	Atkin	Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd				Object	(See attached document) 6.1. Policy G1 is unnecessary and a clear duplication of other policies within the plan. 6.2. Moreover, the policy seeks to unreasonably elevate the status of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and external / Third Party guidance which are not subject to the same rigor as the statutory Development Plan and is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy and should be deleted.
2026Reg18/101	3	Question 008 Do you support or object to Policy G1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Tetlow King	Iain	Warner	Palm Developments		Palm Developments		Neither	Whilst we have no issues with the general approach of this policy it is not considered necessary to have this set out as a specific development plan policy as all of the criteria are general requirements such as part 1 relating to the need to comply with the local list of requirements for validation. Conflict with that would by virtue result in an invalid application such that it becomes superfluous. The policy should not however have reference to SPD/SPGs given that they are not planning policy documents themselves but only used to reinforce policies.
2026Reg18/108	5	Question 008 Do you support or object to Policy G1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Savills	C	Leckie			Owners Land Old Ferry Road, Iwade		Neither	The Policy identifies 11 criteria that proposals will comply with, where appropriate. These include the need for proposals to accord with policies and guidance within Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance (SPG) (criteria 3), and to provide a statement demonstrating the extent to which a proposal accords with the TCPA Healthy Homes Principles (criterion 4). Other criteria relate to conserving and enhancing the natural, built and historic Environment (criterion 5), responding to climate change and environmental constraints and opportunities (criterion 6), and ensuring development is well-sited and of a sympathetic scale, design and appearance (criterion 7). Several of these criteria are broad and overlap with existing design and environmental policies, particularly those relating to the natural and historic environment. In places, the Policy also duplicates requirements already contained within Policy GD1. This repetition reduces clarity and conflicts with NPPF paragraph 16, which requires policies to be clear, unambiguous, and avoid unnecessary duplication. With regard to Criteria 3, it is important to note that SPDs and SPGs should not be given the same status as Local Plan policy, and this policy should be amended to reflect this point. The requirement for applicants to submit a statement demonstrating compliance with the TCPA Healthy Homes Principles (criteria 4) is not part of national policy. If the Council intends to retain this requirement, the Policy must clearly define which types and scales of development it applies to, ensuring that it remains proportionate and does not delay decision-making. While the TCPA Principles are referenced, it is important to note that the TCPA acts in an advisory capacity and is not a statutory consultee. Their inclusion within policy is therefore not fully justified and raises concerns in relation to NPPF paragraph 36. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/77	1. Objects to this policy and deems it an unnecessary duplication. 2. Seeks that SPDs and third party guidance are removed as they are inconsistent with national planning policy.	1. Noted but the Council believes that this policy adds value to the Development Plan by providing a framework. 2. The Council will consider amending the wording in criteria 3 to reflect the differences between SPD/SPGs and planning policy documents. (Consider "Accord with policies and consider guidance in the Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.") Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/101	1. It is not considered necessary to set out the general approach as a specific development plan policy as all of the criteria are are general requirements, resulting in an invalid application should conflict arise. 2. SPD/SPGs should not be referenced as they are not planning policy documents themselves.	1. The Council disagrees as these criterion provide an overarching framework for Policy G1. 2. The Council will consider amending the wording in criteria 3 to reflect the differences between SPD/SPGs and planning policy documents. (Consider "Accord with policies and consider guidance in the Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.") Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/108	1. Seeks to reduce the repetition contained within the policy to ensure clarity (currently many criteria are broad and overlap) and reduce duplication (especially with regards to Policy GD1), as per NPPF paragraph 16. 2. Seeks that the policy be amended to ensure that SPDs and SPGs are not given the same status as Local Plan policy.	1. The Council disagrees as the purpose of Policy G1 is to provide a framework of General Development Criteria. 2. The Council will consider rewording criteria 3 to take account of the difference in status of SPDs/SPGs and Local Plan Policy. (Consider "Accord with policies and consider guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document and Guidance, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.") Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/14	8	Question 009 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble?				Faversham Town Council			'Policy GD1 Local Design Principles' No reference to Neighbourhood Plans here. Should it signpost? As NP's often have more detailed locally specific design principles. FNP includes many policies that include locally specific design elements. Also, Nationally Described Space Standards are included. This does not allow for change, should the standards be re-named. This comment is relevant to a number of other policies throughout the Plan where the policy includes external documents as explained above.		
2026Reg18/16	8	Question 009 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	5 Should be 'topographical features' or 'features of topography'. § 10 'Separately, they must formally address future occupiers by having their local council approve a new postal address, ensuring street and property names and numbers are clearly displayed, and then informing purchasers/tenants of their new address.' How on earth is this relevant to 'local design'? Add 'Where commercial development is proposed in proximity to residential areas, steps should be taken to safeguard residential amenity e.g. by the imposition of height restrictions and vegetative screening.'		
2026Reg18/62	6	Question 009 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble?				Maidstone Borough Council			Paragraph 6.0.3 suggested amendment: '...with all other policies in the Plan and any relevant, and associated national, regional and local design guidance...'		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/14	Seeks amendment to signpost neighbourhood plans because there is no reference to them, but they can contain more detailed and specific design principles. The plan mentions Nationally described space standards which does not allow for change should it be renamed.	Although the preamble references relevant and associated national, regional and local design guidance, relevant Design Codes, development briefs and Masterplans an explicit reference to Neighbourhood Plans can be made. Partial Change Proposed. The Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) provides a consistent framework for the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) and storage space for new homes in England. While not mandatory on its own, the NPPF enables local authorities to adopt these standards via Local Plans hence its reference in the document.
2026Reg18/16	Seeks amendment to "topographical features" or "features of topography," Seeks amendment to remove the requirement about obtaining a council-approved postal address and notifying occupants as it is not relevant to the local design section. Seeks amendment to add a policy that commercial development near residential areas should protect residential amenity, for example through height restrictions and vegetative screening.	This response appears to relate to the policy and therefore Question 10. The Council agrees that under criterion 5 the wording needs to be updated for grammatical reasons. Change proposed. The Council agrees to remove the section on the postal address as it does not relate to design. Change proposed. The Council disagrees, as this is considered within the policy and elsewhere within the plan. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/62	Seeks an amendment to paragraph 6.0.3 '...with all other policies in the Plan andany relevant, andassociated national, regional and local design guidance...'	Comment noted. The Council agrees for the following reasons: To future-proof the sentence and make it more comprehensive. Changes proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	100	Question 009 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	Eastchurch Parish Council has reviewed the preamble to Policy GD1 (Local Design Principles). The Parish Council agrees with the content of the preamble and 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 also supported, particularly for developments of significant scale or sensitivity. To make the preamble more relatable and locally focused, Eastchurch Parish Council suggests that greater emphasis could be placed on: The importance of reflecting the character and setting of rural and coastal communities, including smaller villages such as Eastchurch; The need to respect landscape context, including open countryside and coastal environments; and The value of early engagement with parish councils as part of the pre-application process, particularly in rural areas where local context is critical to achieving appropriate design outcomes. Including a clearer acknowledgement of rural and coastal distinctiveness would strengthen the link between high-level design principles and the lived character of settlements across the borough. Subject to these observations, Eastchurch Parish Council agrees with and supports the preamble to Policy GD1.		
2026Reg18/108	6	Question 009 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble?	Savills	C	Leckie			Owners Land Old Ferry Road, Iwade	This policy sets out the Council's expectations for high quality, well designed development across the Borough. It requires all proposals to positively respond to local character, be well integrated with their surroundings, and create attractive, distinctive and sustainable places. The policy also requires developments with 'significant design implications' to be referred to a Design Review Panel (DRP). We support the need to incorporate good design principles into development proposals, and the intention behind Policy GD1 is clear. However, its effectiveness is undermined by its length, density, and the breadth of the criteria. The policy is not easy to read or interpret, particularly given the number of overlapping and sometimes repetitive requirements. This results in a policy that is overly detailed and difficult to navigate. The requirement for DRP for proposals with 'significant design implications' is unclear and subjective, as the Plan provides no definition or threshold. Without measurable criteria, applicants cannot predict whether their scheme triggers this requirement, creating uncertainty and risking inconsistent decision-making. To ensure clarity and proportionality in line with NPPF paragraph 16, the policy should specify the types or scales of development that require a Design Review. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Seeks amendment to the preamble to make it more relatable and locally focused with reference to character and settings of rural and coastal communities, landscape such as open countryside and coastal environments and early engagement with parish Council's. Should include clearer acknowledgment of rural and coastal distinctiveness would strengthen the link between design principles and character across the borough.	The Council (partially) agrees that local distinctiveness and character could be strengthened in the preamble. Partial changes proposed. The Council (partially) agrees that local distinctiveness and character could be strengthened in the preamble. Partial changes proposed.
2026Reg18/108	Supports the need to incorporate good design into development however the policy is difficult to read. The section on DRP for proposals with 'significant design implications' is subjective and unclear because the plan does not provide a definition or threshold. With this, applicants cannot interpret if their development triggers this requirement. Seeks amendment for the policy to specify the types or scales of development that require a Design Review.	Comment noted. Consideration will be given to the wording. The Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review. However, it is agreed that the policy wording requires a partial change. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/3	10	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your				Dunkirk Parish Council				Support	Mostly support. Again, should include neighbourhood plans and argue for higher NDSS to show the Council really has aspirational values for the Borough and its residents.
2026Reg18/16	9	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham		Neither	5 Should be 'topographical features' or 'features of topography'. § 10 'Separately, they must formally address future occupiers by having their local council approve a new postal address, ensuring street and property names and numbers are clearly displayed, and then informing purchasers/tenants of their new address.' How on earth is this relevant to 'local design'? Add 'Where commercial development is proposed in proximity to residential areas, steps should be taken to safeguard residential amenity e.g. by the imposition of height restrictions and vegetative screening.'
2026Reg18/33	10	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to				Queenborough Town Council	Town	Clerk		Object	Development proposals should include evidence of the use of robust materials used and assurances of the longevity of the structures/ buildings.
2026Reg18/59	4	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Home Builders Federation	M	Behrendt		Neither	12. There is a potential for conflict in the approach being set out by the Council that should be addressed in the local plan. For example, there is a strong focus on high quality design that respects the local character of the area (part 2 and 8) whilst also required development to minimise energy consumption. The Council must recognise that it is not always possible to resolve both of these matters. Minimising energy consumption and the provision of renewable technologies can require the use of materials that are not in keeping with the character of the area. The use of solar panels on roofs or materials that are lower in embodied carbon may not be in keeping with the character of the area but will be necessary to reduce carbon emissions. The Council must be clear that it will take a flexible approach to decision making with regard to local design principles, or other policies, where there is a conflict. 13. HBF would also recommend that the reference to robust materials is removed from part 8 as there is no agreed definition as to what robust would constitute with regard to building materials and this could prevent developers from using new materials and design processes that speed up delivery or reduce embodied carbon. 14. Finally, it is not clear why part 10 of the policy includes reference to the approval of new postal addresses and why this needs to be included as a policy in the local plan

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/3	Seeks amendment to include neighbourhood plans and for a higher NDSS.	Partially agree with neighbourhood plans now explicitly referenced in preamble. The Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) provides a consistent framework for the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) and storage space for new homes in England. While not mandatory on its own, the NPPF enables local authorities to adopt these standards via Local Plans hence its reference in the document.
2026Reg18/16	Seeks amendment to "topographical features" or "features of topography,". Seeks amendment to remove the requirement about obtaining a council-approved postal address and notifying occupants as it is not relevant to the local design section. Seeks amendment by adding a policy that commercial development near residential areas should protect residential amenity, for example through height restrictions and vegetative screening.	The Council agrees that under criterion 5 the wording needs to be updated for grammatical reasons. Partial Change Proposed. The Council agrees to remove the section on postal addresses. Change proposed. Residential amenity is considered under criterion 9. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/33	Development proposals should include evidence of the use of robust materials used and assurances of the longevity of the structures/ buildings.	The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and completeness. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/59	Neither supports or objects the policy Brings attention to potential conflict within the policy, for example, high quality design that respects the local character can conflict with minimising energy consumption. The latter can require materials that are not in the character of the local area like solar panels. Seeks amendment to part 8 of the policy to remove robust material as there is no agreed definition on robust materials and this could prevent developers from using new materials and design processes that speed up delivery or reduce embodied carbon. Seeks amendment to part 10 to remove the reference to approved postal addresses.	Comment noted. No change proposed. Comment noted. Both aspects - sustainability and character - remains key aspects of the Government's approach to design and inclusion within the policy is therefore consistent with that approach. No change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and completeness. Change to include durability shown under Criterion 8 above. Partial change proposed. The Council agrees to remove the section on postal addresses. Change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/60	6	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Lichfields	Sally	Furminger	Taylor Wimpey				Object	Generally, Taylor Wimpey do not object to the current draft of Policy GD1 (Local Design Principles), notwithstanding the point made above in the representations, that it is likely the Council will need to ensure all development management policies in the Plan do not conflict with the new NPPF during the course of the Local Plan's emergence. However, it is not clear why part 10 of Policy CD1 includes reference to the approval of new postal addresses – this would not appear to be a planning matter and therefore Taylor Wimpey question why this needs to be included as a policy in the Local Plan. It is recommended that this is deleted. Further, it is recommended that part 9 of the policy is updated to reflect the sequence of assessment that takes place when bringing forward a planning application (additions in bold/underline): “Demonstrating that there is no significant adverse impact that cannot be appropriately mitigated on nearby properties by noise, dust, odour or light pollution or that new development does not prejudice or undermine existing surrounding uses”. Further, part 8 of the policy refers to the need for materials to be ‘robust’. Taylor Wimpey use high quality materials in all of its developments; however, it is recommended that reference to ‘robust’ is removed from the policy text – the term is a subjective and unmeasurable in respect of building materials and could cause unintended delays at the detailed design stage.
2026Reg18/73	48	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	Eastchurch Parish Council supports Policy GD1. The Parish Council welcomes the comprehensive and detailed approach to securing high quality design across the borough. In particular, the emphasis on reinforcing local character, integrating development with its surroundings, promoting inclusive and safe environments, delivering biodiversity net gain, and ensuring high standards of accommodation is strongly supported. The requirement to comply with Nationally Described Space Standards and to demonstrate design quality through Design and Access Statements is also welcomed. The policy provides a robust framework for achieving well-designed, sustainable places and aligns appropriately with national planning policy and the Healthy Homes principles. To strengthen the policy further, Eastchurch Parish Council suggests the following additions or clarifications: Stronger recognition of rural and coastal character: Whilst the policy refers to coastal and creek environments, additional emphasis could be placed on protecting the character, setting and landscape of smaller rural villages, including their relationship with open countryside and agricultural land. Cumulative impact and infrastructure context: The policy could reference the need to consider cumulative impacts where areas already accommodate significant infrastructure or energy development, ensuring that further proposals do not erode local distinctiveness. Infrastructure integration: Greater clarity that high quality design must also account for infrastructure capacity particularly highways, healthcare and school provision so that design excellence is supported by functional sustainability. Protection and enhancement of active travel corridors: Explicit recognition of

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/60	Seeks amendment to part 10 to remove the reference to the approval of new postal codes as this is not a planning matter. Seeks the following amendment to part 9 "Demonstrating that there is no significant adverse impactthat cannot be appropriately mitigatedon nearby properties by noise, dust, odour or light pollution or that new development does not prejudice or undermine existing surrounding uses". Seeks amendment to part 8 to remove the term robust as this is subjective and unmeasurable.	The Council agrees to remove the section on postal addresses. Change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and completeness. Change shown under Criterion 9 above. Partial change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and completeness. Change to include durability shown under Criterion 8 above. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/73	Supports policy. seeks amendment to strengthen the policy by adding emphasis on stronger recognition of rural and coastal character. seeks amendment to strengthen the policy by adding cumulative impact and infrastructure context. seeks amendment to strengthen the policy by adding infrastructure integration and protection. seeks amendment to strengthen the policy by adding enhancement of active travel corridors.	Noted. The Council agrees the that local character can be more closely woven into the policy wording. Partial change proposed. Noted - This appears to be a landscape point. No change proposed. Noted - This appears to be relevant to S106 and/or energy point. No change proposed. Noted and considered under criterion 4. No change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/74	8	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society		Neither	We could also add the need for durability and strength required for future developments, adaptability to global warming, more social/communal housing projects and aesthetics combined according to professional standards.No 7 should include the following: Providing a high standard of accommodation that does not differentiate between the design quality of market and affordable housing and is sustainable in design by minimising energy consumption by optimising the orientation of the dwellings, providing adequate levels of insulation, maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies. Additionally, superficial copying of traditional models should be avoided and contemporary designs that incorporate renewable and low carbon technologies will be welcomed.
2026Reg18/88	5	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	Cameron	Chapman	Malro Homes (c/o Agent)		Malro Homes		Neither	See attached document 5 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES5.1 POLICY G1: GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA5.1.1Criterion (4) sets out a requirement for Applications to demonstrate accordance with the TCPA Healthy Homes Principles (HHP). Whilst we support the aspirations of the HHP, we would comment that the requirement for all homes to be designed as inclusive, accessible, and adaptable (i.e., the provision of M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings) is overly onerous and not justifiable. This is especially the case on the Isle of Sheppey, where scheme viability is already a huge concern.5.1.2As currently drafted Criterion (9) sits at odds with national guidance and the consultation NPPF, this is as a result of setting out increased restrictions for developments and their associated impacts on amenity. To ensure a justified Policy that is consistent with national guidance we recommend that the Policy be worded as follows:“Preserve amenity and cause no significant harm to other sensitive uses or areas”.
2026Reg18/91	2	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Housing	Charles	Glover-Short		Neither	While we support the broad themes running through the policy, we believe the policy could be made more concise to ensure it remains accessible and easily understood by all users and sizes and types of developers. Since the design review panel is referred to in the supporting text, the Council should consider removing or amending the last paragraph of the policy wording. At present, the last paragraph states that: “where significant design implications are identified in development proposals, these will be referred to a Design Review Panel.” The current wording does not therefore specify any criteria and instead leaves some ambiguity regarding when a scheme will go before a design review panel. More specific criteria should therefore be added to either the supporting text, policy or to a supporting document to ensure certainty for developers.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/74	Seeks amendment to add the need for durability and strength for future development, adaptability to global warming, more social/communal housing projects and aesthetics combined according to professional standards. Seeks amendment to criteria 7 to include 'Providing a high standard of accommodation that does not differentiate between the design quality of market and affordable housing and is sustainable in design by minimising energy consumption by optimising the orientation of the dwellings, providing adequate levels of insulation, maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies. Additionally, superficial copying of traditional models should be avoided and contemporary designs that incorporate renewable and low carbon technologies will be welcomed.'	The Council partially agrees and has included reference to durability in the preamble and policy body (Criterion 8 below). Partial change agreed. The Council partially agrees and has included reference to the design quality of affordable housing and sustainable design and construction principles within Criterion 7 (above). Outstanding or innovative design is addressed in Criterion 9 (below). Partial change agreed.
2026Reg18/88	Supports the aspirations of the Healthy Homes Principles, but thinks it can be onerous, especially in the case of the Isle of Sheppey because viability is already a concern. Seeks amendment to criterion 9 to "Preserve amenity and cause no significant harm to other sensitive uses or areas" so it is consistent with national policy.	Comment noted. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and completeness. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/91	Seeks amendment to make the policy more concise. Seeks amendment to remove or change the reference of the design review panel in the last paragraph of the policy since it is mentioned in the supporting text. Seeks amendment for specific criteria relating to the passage "where significant design implications are identified in development proposals, these will be referred to a Design Review Panel."	Partially agreed and revisions above have made the policy more concise. Council disagrees as including Design Review within the policy anchors the process to the development plan, giving it more weight. Partially agreed, the Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/112	4	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	D	Lawrence (DHA Planning)	Sheppey Gateway Ltd				Neither	1.5.5 The Policy as currently drafted as it is unnecessarily lengthy, with elements of the Policy being able to be located within the pre-amble or be secured by validation requirements to ensure an effective Policy. 1.5.6 To ensure consistency with national guidance we would recommend that the Policy wording of Criterion (7) be amended to remove “by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies”. We would however note that the aspirations of Policy GD1 with regard to sustainable design and minimising energy consumption are broadly covered by Policy C1. SBC should therefore review the Policy wording to reduce any unnecessary repetition. 1.5.7 Criterion (10), states that developers must ensure new housing must have an approved new postal address which is outside the remit of the Planning process and can be appropriately secured by Planning Condition or Informative. 1.5.8 The Policy continues to set out the requirements to undertake a Design Review Panel (DRP). We would object to the current wording of this on the basis of the requirement being unacceptable and unjustified. We raise significant concern over the inclusion of “where significant design implications are identified” as this is currently very ambiguous. 1.5.9 Should SBC maintain that the requirement for DRP to be included within Policy, then we would recommend that this be amended to be included within the pre-amble providing generic comments on how DRPs can assist in achieving high standards of design. We would additionally affirm that at a minimum, SBC should seek to enforce a threshold number of dwellings to trigger the requirement for DRPs. We would recommend that this should be a minimum of 300 dwellings. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT
2026Reg18/113	8	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	A	Day (DHA Planning)	Pentland Homes				Neither	2.2.3This policy is generally supported, however we comment that the need for developers to ensure the Council approve new postal addresses is outside the remit of planning and as such does not need to form part of planning policy. If SBC continue to require this then it could be secured via planning condition or informative on any decision. Additionally, this could be included within the pre-amble and not detract from providing a clearly worded policy with a clear purpose.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/112	Supports GD1, but believes it is lengthy. Seeks amendment to policy by placing elements of the policy in the preamble or secured by validation requirements. Seeks amendment that the examples in criterion 6 and 7 should be moved to the preamble. Seeks amendment to criterion 7 to remove "by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies". Seeks amendment in criterion 10 to move further guidance beyond how dwellings should incorporate Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) to the preamble. Additionally, approved new postal addresses are not within the remit of planning. Seeks amendment for criterion 10 to be reworded to "The (NDSS) Nationally Described Space Standards or any subsequent document". Raises concerns over Design Review Panel (DRP) and how ambiguous the wording "where significant design implications are identified" is. DRPs should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. If SBC maintains the requirement of DRP within policy, then seeks amendment that the preamble includes generic comments on how DRPs can assist in achieving high standards of design. Seeks an amendment to enforce a minimum of 300 dwellings for a DRP.	The Council responded to a similar point above and agreed to tighten policy criteria with some elements moved to preamble. Partial change proposed. As above. Partial change proposed. The Council partially agrees and has amended criterion 7 to refer sustainable design and construction principles in accordance with Policy C1. Partial change proposed. The Council agrees to remove the section of postal addresses in criteria 10. Partial change proposed. The Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review. However, it is agreed that the policy wording requires a partial change. Partial change proposed. As above. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/113	Supports policy, but the need for developers to ensure council approve new postal address is outside the remit of the planning system. If this is required, then it could be secured via planning condition or informative on any decision. Seeks amendment to move it to the preamble.	The Council agrees to remove the section on postal addresses. Change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/114	7	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	LRM Planning	T	Whipps			W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd			(See attached document) 5.5This policy seeks to ensure that new development responds and enhances local character and distinctiveness through a series of requirements, in summary these are:1. Promotion of high-quality design2. Is of an appropriate destiny3. Creates a sense of place4. Integrates with surrounding streets and open spaces 5. Provide high quality opens spaces and public realm6. Provide public spaces that are inclusive, safe and accessible7. Provides high standard of accommodation that is sustainable and minimises energy consumption8. Is appropriate for the area9. There is no loss of amenity for neighbouring residents10. New development meets the Nationally Described Space Standards For development with significant design implications, applications will be referred to a Design Review Panel. 5.6 As this policy is broad and generalised, there are limited comments to make, and the policy is generally supported. However, the requirements at Policy GD1(10) for developers to approve a new postal address with the Council is not a valid planning consideration and falls outside of the remit of the planning system. It is considered that the need to refer a development proposal to a Design Review Panel should relate to major applications only and the policy wording should be amended accordingly.
2026Reg18/120	6	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	L	Sinden (DHA)	Persimmon Homes				Support	4.2.1 Persimmon broadly supports the aspirations of Policy GD1 which seeks to further the aims of Policy G1 by ensuring developments demonstrate they have incorporated good design principles. However, as currently drafted the Policy is unnecessarily lengthy. This could be simplified by inserting elements of the Policy within the pre-amble or be secured by validation requirements to ensure an effective Policy. 4.2.2 For example, both Criterion (6) and (7) include examples of achieving the policy objectives. To ensure a clearly written Policy, with a clear purpose that is consistent with national policy, these examples should be moved to the pre-amble. 4.2.3 Criterion (7) sets out how new development should be sustainable in design through minimising energy consumption “by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies”. To ensure consistency with national guidance we would recommend that the Policy wording of Criterion (7) be amended to remove “by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies”. 4.2.4 Criterion (10) sets out how dwellings should incorporate Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). We however note that the Policy continues on to provide further guidance that should be included within the pre-amble, in the interests of providing a clearly worded Policy with a clear purpose. Indeed, further requirements are set out by Criterion (10), including having an approved new postal address which is outside the remit of the Planning process and can be appropriately secured by Planning Condition or Informative. Criterion (10) should be reworded to “The (NDSS) Nationally Described Space Standards or any subsequent document”. 4.2.5 The Policy continues to set out the requirements to undertake a Design Review Panel (DRP). We raise significant concern over the inclusion of “where significant design implications are identified” as this is currently very ambiguous. It is imperative Policies are clear and unambiguous so that it is evident how the decision maker should react to proposals, invariably pushing developments to

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/114	Supports the policy in general, but criterion 10 regarding developers to approve a new postal address falls out the remit of the planning system. Seeks amendment so the need of a design review panel should only be for major applications.	Comment Noted. The Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review. The Council agrees to remove the section on postal addresses. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/120	Supports GD1, but believes it is lengthy. Seeks amendment to policy by placing elements of the policy in the preamble or secured by validation requirements. Seeks amendment that the examples in criterion 6 and 7 should be moved to the preamble. Seeks amendment to criterion 7 to remove "by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies". Seeks amendment in criterion 10 to move further guidance beyond how dwellings should incorporate Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) to the preamble. Additionally, approved new postal addresses are not within the remit of planning. Seeks amendment for criterion 10 to be reworded to "The (NDSS) Nationally Described Space Standards or any subsequent document". Design Review Panel (DRP) is ambiguous. DRPs should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. If SBC maintains the requirement of DRP within policy, then seeks amendment that the preamble includes generic comments on how DRPs can assist in achieving high standards of design. Seeks an amendment to enforce a minimum of 300 dwellings for a DRP.	The Council agrees that consideration can be given to the wording to tighten policy criteria and supported by a preamble that supports context.Partial change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and to reduce policy wording.Partial change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and to reduce policy wording.Partial change proposed. The Council (partially) agrees for clarity and to reduce policy wording and removing. The Council agree to remove the part of postal addresses from the policy.Partial change proposed. The Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review. However, the Council agrees that the policy wording requires a partial change. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/124	7	Question 010 Do you support or object to Policy GD1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent				Support	See attached document 5.3.1 Fernham Homes broadly support the aspirations of Policy GD1 which seeks to further the aims of Policy G1 by ensuring developments demonstrate they have incorporated good design principles. In response to Questions 9 and 10 of the Consultation document we provide comment on the wording of the Policy as currently drafted as it is unnecessarily lengthy, with elements of the Policy being able to be located within the pre-amble or be secured by validation requirements to ensure an effective Policy. 5.3.2 Criterion (6) sets out how public spaces in and out of buildings should be inclusive, safe and accessible for all. The Policy sets out examples of achieving this. To ensure a clearly written Policy, with a clear purpose that is consistent with national policy, these examples should be moved to the pre-amble. 5.3.3 Criterion (7) sets out how new development should be sustainable in design through minimising energy consumption “by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies”. However, as above, examples demonstrating compliance with Policy should be included within the pre-amble to ensure a clearly written Policy. To ensure consistency with national guidance we would recommend that the Policy wording of Criterion (7) be amended to remove “by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies”. We would however note that the aspirations of Policy GD1 with regard to sustainable design and minimising energy consumption are broadly covered by Policy C1. SBC should therefore review the Policy wording to reduce any unnecessary repetition. 5.3.4 Criterion (10) sets out how dwellings should incorporate Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). We however note that the Policy continues on to provide further guidance that should be included within the pre-amble, in the interests of providing a clearly worded Policy with a clear purpose. Indeed, further requirements are set out by Criterion (10), including having an approved
2026Reg18/58	12	Question 012 Do you support or object to Policy GD2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Hernhill Parish Council				Support	See answer to question 11. 'Support and should also include that it must be be appropriate for the local community. There needs to be greater emphasis on deferring to Neighbourhood Plans, Design Guides and the Parish Councils for local needs.' ANSWER DUPLICATED AT QUESTION 11.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/124	Supports policy, but it is unnecessarily long Seeks amendment to move examples of how public spaces can achieve inclusivity, safety and accessibility should be moved to the preamble. Seeks amendment to remove "by maximising opportunities for passive solar energy and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies" from the policy and add examples on how to do this to the preamble. Seeks amendment so that further guidance regarding criterion 10 and to be reworded to the following "The (NDSS) Nationally Described Space Standards or any subsequent document". Raises concerns regarding the Design Review Panel because the wording "where significant design implications are identified" is ambiguous. Seeks amendment so the policy is clear and unambiguous or removed as this DRPs should be a case-by-case basis. However, if SBC maintain this requirement, then an amendment should be included within the preamble providing generic comments on how DRPs can assist in achieving high standards of design. Seeks further amendment so that SBC should enforce a minimum of 300 dwellings to trigger a DRP. Seeks amendment to include an alternative DRP, which is reviewed by an independent design consultancy appointed by the applicant.	Comment noted. Change proposed. Partially agreed for clarity and conciseness. Partial change proposed. As above. Partial change proposed. Agreed for clarity and futureproofing. Change proposed. The Council is currently preparing a Design Review protocol that will provide the procedural framework for design review. However, it is agreed that the policy wording requires a partial change. Partial change proposed. As above, the DRP will be independent and procedure set out in the DRP protocol.
2026Reg18/58	Supports policy Seeks amendment so that it includes that it must be appropriate for the local community and greater emphasis on deferring to neighbourhood plans, design guides and the parish councils for local needs.	Comment noted. Partially agreed, in so far as the preamble can reference other plans and guides. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	9	Question 018 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.4 Housing2.4.1 H2 Small and medium sites for housing development2.4.1.1 Policy criteriaNatural England notes that this policy includes the requirement for a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain (BNG) to be achieved for small and medium sites for housing development (criterion 5). We refer you to our advice regarding the evidence base required to implement a 20% net gain requirement in paragraph 2.8.1.4 of this letter. The Draft Plan includes an overarching Policy B1 which sets out the BNG requirements for all developments. We refer you to our overarching comments in paragraph 2.1. It would be Natural England’s preference to remove criterion 5 from policy H2 and rely on strong overarching policies in the Draft Plan. Should the Council choose to retain criterion 5, we advise that a link could instead be made to Policy B1 to ensure that all of the criteria for BNG are covered, and this criterion should be added to all other policies that BNG would apply to for consistency. If criterion 5 is retained, we would suggest the following amended wording: “5. Proposals include measures to achieve a biodiversity net gain in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation and biodiversity net gain of a minimum of 20%;
2026Reg18/62	14	Question 018 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Maidstone Borough Council				Support	Broad support for the policy and the recognition of the contribution that SME builders make to meeting housing needs. Criterion 4 – may read better as follows ‘...is designed in a way that preserves residential amenity, designated heritage assets, environmental assets, and is landscape-led where appropriate, and environmental assets; Criterion 8 – may read better as follows ‘The provision of Affordable housing will be provided on site in accordance with Policy H1 Affordable Housing unless there is clear evidence...’

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Seeks amendment of this policy/pre-amble as follows 1. Proposals should include measures to achieve a biodiversity net gain in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation and biodiversity net gain of a minimum of 20%	The Council agrees for the following reasons 1. A link to policy B1 would allow easier navigation through the document Change Proposed
2026Reg18/62	1 Broad support for this policy 2. Supports this policy and proposes minor wording amendments to make the policy criteria clearer	The Council agrees for the following reasons: The amendments make the policy criteria clearer and amendment to criteria 4 and 8 as follows Criterion 4 -...is designed in a way that preserves residential amenity, designated heritage assets, environmental assets, and is landscape-led where appropriate,; Criterion 8 - Affordable housing will be provided on site in accordance with Policy H1 Affordable Housing unless there is clear evidence...' Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/114	9	Question 018 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	LRM Planning	T	Whipps			W.T. Lamb Holdings Ltd			(See attached document) 5.11 The preamble of this policy notes that the NPPF states that Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) house builders can make a significant contribution to housing supply. It notes that paragraph 73 (erroneously labelled as 68) requires the Council to ensure that 10% of its housing requirement is met on sites which are no larger than 1Ha. 5.12 The policy text states that the proposals for small and medium sites will be supported subject to a number of criteria. Most notably these requirements are that it must deliver sustainable development following the settlement hierarchy, must be brought forward by an organisation or company that identifies itself as an SME and must not be part of a larger site. The remaining requirements of the policy repeat requirements from other policies in relation to such matters of design etc (and are therefore not strictly necessary). The policy has been written in such a way that it is does not conflict with the NPPF. 5.13 As an SME, WTL supports Policy H2 in principle. However, it should be clarified within the policy whether it relates to a site area of no larger than 1 hectare, or a threshold of between 10 – 60 dwellings (as referred to at paragraph 10.0.2 of the supporting text). This is not currently clear. Given that paragraph 10.0.3 of the supporting text commits to achieving 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare through allocations in the next Regulation 19 version of the plan (to comply with paragraph 73 of the NPPF), it appears logical that Policy H2 is based upon supporting alternative proposals on small and medium sized sites of between 10-60 dwellings (as opposed to a site area threshold). 5.14 It is noted that Policy H2 refers to compliance with a settlement hierarchy which will not be clarified until the next Regulation 19 version of the plan. WTL therefore requests the right to comment further on Policy H2 at the Regulation 19 stage. On a general point, and for the sake of completeness, it is assumed that the next Regulation 19 version of the plan will include all Development Management Policies, thereby allowing further comments to be made on these

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/114	1. Supports this policy 2. Comments it should be clarified within the policy whether it relates to a site area of no larger than 1 hectare, or a threshold of between 10 - 60 dwellings 3. Comments that the respondent reserves the right to comments further on this policy when the whole local plan is consulted upon at Regulation 19.	1. Noted 2. It is consider the Policy seeks development by SMEs and site approaches are provided in the preamble to guide the range of sites sizes this type of developer has preference for. 3. Noted No change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/124	3	Question 018 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent					See attached documents 2.1 OVERVIEW 2.1.1 Fernham Homes is an award-winning regional housebuilder based in West Malling, Kent. Fernham has a strong track record and reputation for delivering high quality residential and mixed-use developments in sustainable locations in Kent, East Sussex and southeast London over the last 26 years. Fernham have been recognised for excellence in housebuilding; achievements include the Evening Standard New Homes Award 2021 and 2022, the In-House Gold Award for Customer Satisfaction five years running, the Outstanding Achievement Award in 2024 and the What House Gold Award for Small Housebuilders in November 2025. In addition to this, Fernham have been regularly rewarded for health and safety performance including Small Builder Regional Winner at the Homebuilder Safety Awards and RoSPA Gold Award 2025. 2.1.2 The business is led by experts in their fields, with decades of experience in planning, design, and the delivery of new homes and places. Strong progress is being made on Fernham Homes' business plan to deliver around 425 homes per year in the next five years. Fernham's vision is to be the homebuilder of choice in Kent for all stakeholders, including the communities within which they build, the supply chain, their customers and the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) they work with. 2.1.3 SME / regional housebuilders are recognised – including by the Planning Inspectorate1 - as making an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area and being able to build out relatively quickly. This is particularly the case with Fernham Homes, which is privately owned with access to significant resources, and is demonstrated below. This provides significantly more flexibility than national and other regional housebuilders and allows Fernham Homes to deliver housing rapidly and to a high-quality sustainable standard. See P11 of attached - Speed of Delivery 2.1.4 The support for SMEs such as Fernham Homes is recognised within
2026Reg18/126	10	Question 018 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Policy H2 Small and Medium Sites for Housing Development Investment TeamThe County Council notes that there is no mention of its Developer Contributions Guide and would ask that this is included.
2026Reg18/14	13	Question 020 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Faversham Town Council				Support	FTC strongly support 'Policy H3 Rural exception and community-led housing development'.This is reflective of FNP policy 'FAV 3 Residential Mix and Standards' clause 3 which supports community-led housing. It may be appropriate in the glossary to add reference to 'community-led' housing and community land trusts, including a sentence on how this can be an alternative way to deliver affordable housing.
2026Reg18/62	15	Question 020 Do you support or object to Policy H2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your				Maidstone Borough Council				Support	Broad support for the policy. Criterion 3d – is there clarification on what might a Statement of Community Involvement might need to include, beyond the 'significant input of the parish council'? As the evidence of the support of the Parish Council is also required under criterion 3a.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/124	1. Provides context behind the development company as an SME and seeks to promote its sites through the Local Plan process. 2. Supports this policy 3. Seeks amendment of Criteria 1 of this policy to "It can be demonstrated that the proposals will deliver sustainable development, following the Swale settlement hierarchy, unless material considerations justify a departure" 4. Seeks to amendment Criteria 2 to remove the reference to identification as a SME developers and the wording be amended to further support for the delivery of small and medium sites by SME developers. 5. Criterion (3) the wording needs to be reviewed to ensure a positively prepared and unambiguous, clearly written Policy, this is because many larger sites are subdivided into phases after attaining an Outline Planning Permission. 6. Criterion (5) we firmly object to SBC seeking to require the delivery of a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) 7. Criterion (6) should be amended to the following:"All dwellings meet National design standards and have had regard to relevant Policies within this Plan". 8. Seeks an amendment as follows to Criterion (7) to remove the term bespoke as it is overly prescriptive and onerous. 9. Seeks an amendment to Criterion (8) as currently worded sets out unnecessary duplication with Policy H1. 10. Seeks amendment to Criterion (9), to remove the reference to the requirement for Applications to include schemes of hard and soft landscaping for brevity and to include within the preamble.	1. Noted 2. Noted 3. The Council disagrees for the following reasons that the additional wording would conflict with the Local Plan and national planning objectives of sustainable development 4. The Council disagrees for the following reasons the wording in the policy for criteria 2 is appropriate as it actively supports those who identify as SME developers. 5. The Council disagrees for the following reasons the wording as presented in the policy allows for consideration of sub division at the planning application stage that could include outline or detailed planning. 6. The Council disagrees for the following reasons the council wishes to seek a higher BNG than the minimum set out in national policy and has viability tested the preferred approach against a range of site sizes and locational typologies. 7. The Council disagrees for the following reasons this is unnecessary wording clarification as the local plan should be read as a whole include policies on these matters 8. Propose change to remove the word bespoke from criteria 7 9 and 10 The Council disagrees for the following reasons as this type of housing development is more specialist in focus differing from larger types of site it is considered appropriate to keep the these criteria as presented in the Policy and they are still appropriate for small and medium sized sites.
2026Reg18/126	1. Neither supports or objects to the policy. 2. Requests reference to KCC Developer Contributions guide be added	1. Noted 2. the KCC developer contributions guide would be best referenced in the preamble to this policy. Change proposed to preamble
2026Reg18/14	Supports this policy for the following reasons: That this policy is reflective of Faversham Neighbourhood Plan Policy FAV3 Suggest to add reference to 'community-led' housing and community land trusts, including a sentence on how this can be an alternative way to deliver affordable housing int eh glossary.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: A definition of community led housing development would further inform readers of the Plan. Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/62	1. Supports this policy 2. Seeks clarification of Criteria 3d clarification on what might a Statement of Community Involvement might need to include	1. Noted 2. The Council agrees for the following reasons To set out in the preamble evidence requirements what a Statement of Community Involvement is for the purposes of this policy Change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/29	6	Question 021 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Calpark Estates Ltd.	John	McGee	A more robust way to ensure compliance with the 2015 act is to insist upon a suitably worded Unilateral Undertaking rather than just a pro forma as this is not permitted where proposals are applications for permissions in principle. The Council is wrong to state at 12.0.1 that the initial "landowner" must have primary input into the final design and layout. The definition in section 1(A1) and (A2) of the 2015 Act (as amended) is unrelated to land ownership. Even rented accommodation can qualify. Policy H4 is too narrow to consistently deliver CSB over the plan period and is not underpinned by evidence of demand as advised in Government guidance. Specifically, that local planning authorities should use the demand data from the registers in their area, supported as necessary by additional data from secondary sources (as outlined in the housing and economic development needs guidance), to understand and consider future need for this type of housing in their area. Reliance on exception sites and a 5% threshold for sites over percentage 10 and 20 homes and strategic allocations will not address existing and future demand for this type of housing in the borough over the plan period. There must be specific site allocations to complement this policy and a more holistic strategy to delivery. More specifically reference in H4 that plots be required to "be designed and laid out by the first occupier" is inconsistent with the definition of self and custom housebuilding and will cause confusion if adopted. The layout of a plot on a site does not need to be designed by the occupier. Plots must meet the definition of being serviced under the law but can be laid out by a developer. It is only the home which must be designed by the occupier. There is also no reference to the need for a design code where plots are made available for self-builders which is essential to provide clarity and deliver high		
2026Reg18/40	82	Question 021 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson	BPC have no specific comments on the preamble. Could it be more complete by explaining how such sites are monitored and managed after approval? Is there a higher risk of failure to complete all developments on a self build site with multiple owners?		
2026Reg18/76	21	Question 021 Do you have any specific comments on this preamble? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG have no specific comments on the preamble. Could it be more complete by explaining how such sites are monitored and managed after approval? Is there a higher risk of failure to complete all developments on a self-build site with multiple owners?		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/29	A unilateral undertaking would be a more robust way of ensuring compliance with the 2015 act. Pro formas are not permitted when proposals are applications for permission in principle. Notes that the Council is wrong to state that the initial landowner must have primary input. Policy is too narrow to consistently deliver over the plan period and is not underpinned by government guidance. A holistic strategy including strategic allocation to address existing and future demands. Concerns that 'be designed and laid out by the first occupier' is inconsistent with the definition and can cause confusion. There is no reference to design code. Swale has failed to deliver upon its statutory duties and a change is needed.	The Council disagrees because this is unnecessary against the requirements of the act and accompanying guidance. No change proposed. The Council agrees national guidance say 'initial home owner'. Change proposed. Government guidance is to use the register to assess the needs of the area. No change proposed. Comment noted. No change proposed. The Council agrees as this should 'initial home owner'. Change proposed. The whole plan should be interpreted including the good design policies. No change proposed. Comment noted. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/40	Seeks amendment to the preamble to explain how sites are monitored and manages after approval. Questions if there is a higher risk of failure to complete all developments on a self-build site with multiple owners.	The Council agrees with this amendment as self-build and custom house build are monitored however after approval the Council does not manage the site. Partial change proposed. The Council has set of this Policy to meets its needs. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/76	Seeks amendment to the preamble to explain how sites are monitored and manages after approval. Questions if there is a higher risk of failure to complete all developments on a self-build site with multiple owners.	The Council agrees with this amendment as self-build and custom house build are monitored however after approval the Council does not manage the site. Partial change proposed. The Council has set of this Policy to meets its needs. No change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/59	7	Question 022 Do you support or object to Policy H3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Home Builders Federatio n	M	Behrendt			24. The Council evidence on housing needs from the Self Build register is that since 2016 there has bene an ex-pressed need for 162 plots – around 16 per year. However, more evidence must be provided as to how many self-build plots have come forward over the last 10 year and whether windfall is largely meeting needs for plots in Swale. The fact that the demand for plots appears to be waning would suggest that those looking to find a plot either have done so and there is little need for plots to be provided on development sites of 20 or more homes. If the Council are to have such a policy, it must be justified and at present this is not the case. 25. If there is demand for self-build homes, then the Council must first consider alternative options for providing self-build plots it has considered before placing the burden of meeting these needs on house builders. PPG sets in paragraph 57-025 that planning authorities should not only use planning policies to meet needs but also whether they could use their own land to meet those needs, how have they engaged directly with landowners to try and bring forward specific sites for self-build. It is essential that these mechanism are considered prior to setting requirements in local plans for plot delivery on larger sites. 26. The Council also needs to consider the difficulties in providing self-build plots on new housing developments and how there are coordinated with the development of a wider site. At any one time, there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on-site and therefore from both a practical and health and safety perspective, it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity. It may also be the case that it is unfeasible to provide self-build plots on sites taking into account topography and access and the degree to which self-build and the rest of the side can be developed separately. HBF would therefore recommend that in part 2 of the policy that where developer can show that provision of plots is either unfeasible or unviable then they will not need to be provided. 27. Finally, as with policies on self-build in other local plans the Council will need to set out what happens should the development not be able to sell these

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/59	Notes the self-build register, but believes more information should be given on how many self-build plots have come forward in the last 10 years believes plots on developments of 20 or more homes is not justifiable. Notes the PPG and the need for the Council to consider alternative options before placing the burden on house builders. Notes the Council should consider the difficulties in providing these plots on housing developments. Seeks amendment to part 2 to add where developer can show that provision of plots is either unfeasible or unviable then they will not need to be provided. Seeks amendment to add to the policy a section on marketing period.	The Council disagrees because the Council has a need of 130 individuals seeking 131 plots and 5 associations seeking 32 and only 14 self-build and custom house build have been granted permission, considering the shortfall the Council consider 5% appropriate.No change proposed. Although the PPG does say this, it does not mention a hierarchy in an approach to meet needs for self-build and custom house build, therefore the Council has decided to take a policy approach. No change proposed. The Council disagrees the whole plan viability assessment 2024 notes that requirement for self-build plots is unlikely to impact viability. No change proposed. The Council agrees to add a marketing period for these plots, but 6 months is too short. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/60	2	Question 022 Do you support or object to Policy H3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Lichfields	Sally	Furminger	Taylor Wimpey				Object	TW objects to Policy H4 (self-build and custom build), as it is currently drafted. The policy requires that sites of 20 or more homes will provide at least 5% serviced plots for sale to self builders. However, level of requirement does not appear to have been appropriately justified within the published evidence base. The SHMA (2020) includes one paragraph - 6.51, which recognises ‘The Self Build Portal presents a limited amount of self-build data at a Local Authority level (it contains more information on the national situation).’ The Council’s evidence on housing needs from the Self Build register is that since 2016 there has bene an ex-pressed need for under 20 dwellings per year, however no evidence is included on how many plots have come forward to meet this need. The policy is therefore not currently justified. On this basis, there is no evidence that Swale needs to increase its delivery of self-build housing above that which is currently being provided. In fact, to over-burden development with yet further policy requirements risks undermining viability and overall deliverability of the Plan, particularly when considering the other requirements placed on housing sites in the remainder of the Plan – e.g. BNG, net zero carbon and affordable housing. Anecdotally, Taylor Wimpey’s experience indicates that interest in self-build plots tends to be for larger plots in rural locations or in smaller settlements, and not so typically on plots within larger housing sites. As such, it is not clear that even the annual ‘need’ figure derived from people putting their names on waiting list would all seek a plot on a larger housing scheme on an urban extensions site, for example. As a minimum, the policy should include greater flexibility linked to demonstrated need within a particular locality. Taylor Wimpey also consider that a threshold of 10 homes is very low – this is not evidenced and it must be. It would be prudent for the Council to estimate, based on allocated sites and the expected size of windfall sites, how many self-build plots it estimates this policy will generate (averaged, per year) and how this compares with the historic trend in number of applicants on its Register. This is likely to show that the number of

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/60	Notes the policy and believes it is not justifiable. Raises concerns on viability. Notes that interest in plots are usually larger plots in rural locations or in smaller settlements Notes a need for a marketing period of 6 months. Seeks amendment to add where developer can show that provision of plots is either unfeasible or unviable then they will not need to be provided.	The Council disagrees because the Council has a need of 130 individuals seeking 131 plots and 5 associations seeking 32 and only 14 self-build and custom house build have been granted permission, considering the shortfall the Council consider the policy appropriate. No change proposed. The Council disagrees because the whole plan viability assessment say it is unlikely that self-build plots will impact viability.No change preposed. National guidance only requires the Council to supply plots regardless of location.No change proposed. The Council agrees that a marketing period can be added to this policy, but considers 6 months too short. Partial change proposed. The Council disagrees because the whole plan viability assessment say it is unlikely that self-build plots will impact viability.No change preposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/109	9	Question 022 Do you support or object to Policy H3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Esquire Developm ents	E	Bonthron (Esquire Dev)	Kent SME Network		x		Object	Policy H4 Self-build and custom build Question 22 – Do you support or object to Policy H4? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection? 3.18 The triggers for sites to deliver self/custom build housing are restrictive at thresholds of the provision of 5% of homes for self-builders in sites over 10 homes in rural areas and settlements. The requirement on 10-unit developments within the rural area and smaller settlements requiring 2 homes (10%) imposes self-build on small sites which would impact viability and deliverability, contrary to Policy H2. 3.19 If there is evidence of a significant demand of self-build homes, the Council should consider an alternative delivery mechanism before burdening housebuilders and impacting site viability. Therefore, we recommend that the self-build requirement is either removed or that the policy is reworded whereby a developer can demonstrate delivery is unviable that plots are not provided. 3.20 An alternative to a borough wide self-build requirement would be specific site allocations to meet demand. This would alleviate tension between commercial and self-build units on the same site. 3.21 Finally, we recommend that a marketing period is set for self-build plots. The marketing period can be a minimum of 6-months and if any plot remains unsold for the minimum period they are returned to the landowner to sell without restriction. 3.22 To conclude, the Network are concerned that the requirement of self-build plots would impact the delivery of sites across the Local Plan and mean the plan is found unsound. The Council should consider allocating land specifically to meet the self-build demand, which are more suitable for individuals than plots on a site mixed with commercial housebuilding. Lastly, a marketing period should be incorporated should a development not be able to sell any plots.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/109	Notes the triggers for self-build and custom house build. seeks amendment to remove or reword policy to reflect viability. suggests an alternative approach with site allocations for self-build and custom house building. Recommends a marketing period of 6-months.	Comment noted. No change preposed. The Council disagrees because the whole plan viability assessment say it is unlikely that self-build plots will impact viability. No change preposed. The Council disagrees and additional support for self-build can be found in Policy H2 Small and medium sites for housing development. No change preposed. The Council agrees that a marketing period can be added, but 6 months is too short. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/110	4	Question 022 Do you support or object to Policy H3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Esquire Developm ents	E	Bonthron (Esquire Dev)	Kent SME Network		x		Neither	Policy H4 – Self-build and Custom Build3.10 The triggers for sites to deliver self/custom build housing are restrictive at thresholds of theprovision of 5% of homes for self-builders in sites over 10 homes in rural areas andsettlements. The requirement on 10-unit developments within the rural area and smaller settlements requiring 2 homes (10%) imposes self -build on small sites which would impactviability and deliverability, contrary to Policy H2.3.11 If there is evidence of a significant demand of self -build homes, the Council should consideran alternative delivery mechanism before burdening housebuilders and impacting site viability.Therefore, we recommend that the self-build requirement is either removed or that the policyis reworded whereby a developer can demonstrate delivery is unviable that plots are not provided. 3.12 An alternative to a borough wide self -build requirement would be specific site allocations tomeet demand. This would alleviate tension between commercial and self -build units on thesame site.3.13 Finally, we recommend that a marketing period is set for self -build plots. The marketing periodcan be a minimum of 6-months and if any plot remains unsold for the minimum period theyare returned to the landowner to sell without restriction.3.14 To conclude, the Network are concerned that the requirement of self -build plots wouldimpact the delivery of sites across the Local Plan and mean the plan is found unsound. TheCouncil should consider allocating land specifically to meet the self -build demand, which aremore suitable for individuals than plots on a site mixed with commercial housebuilding. Lastly,a marketing period should be incorporated should a development not be able to sell any plots.
2026Reg18/22	6	Question 028 Do you support or object to Policy H6? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your	Finn's	Mollie	Lay	Finn's				Support	Support but point 3 refers to provision of ‘additional’ dwelling – many farms have no dwellings. Should remove the word ‘additional’.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/110	Notes the policy and believes it will impact viability and deliverability. Seeks amendment to add developer can demonstrate delivery is unviable that plots are not provided. Notes that specific site allocations to meet the demand. Seeks amendment to add a marketing period for 6 months.	The Council disagrees because the Council has a need of 130 individuals seeking 131 plots and 5 associations seeking 32 and only 14 self-build and custom house build have been granted permission, considering the shortfall the Council consider 5% appropriate.No change proposed. Comment noted.No change proposed. The Council agrees that a marketing period should be added, but 6 months is too short.Partial change agree.
2026Reg18/22	Supports this policy Recommends amendment Policy H7 criteria 3 to allow for instances where a farm may not have an existing dwelling.	Noted Propose amending Policy H7 criteria 3 to: 3. There is confidence that the enterprise will remain viable for the foreseeable future and that the provision of a dwelling or an additional dwelling on site is essential for the continued vitality of a farming business through the farm succession process; Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	36	Question 029 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	Eastchurch Parish Council has reviewed the preamble to Policy H8 (Extensions to, and the replacement of, dwellings in the countryside). The Parish Council agrees with the intent of the preamble and supports the balanced approach it sets out. It is reasonable that residents in the countryside should be able to extend or replace dwellings where appropriate, and the emphasis on protecting the tranquillity, beauty and character of Swale's countryside is welcomed. The reference to ensuring extensions and replacement dwellings are proportionate in scale, mass and appearance, and that they do not harm the character of the countryside, is particularly important in rural parishes such as Eastchurch. The continued relevance of the Supplementary Planning Guidance is also supported. To make the preamble more complete and locally relatable, the Parish Council suggests: Reinforcing the importance of protecting rural character and avoiding incremental suburbanisation of the countryside; Emphasising that cumulative extensions over time should be carefully assessed to prevent disproportionate enlargement of original dwellings; and Highlighting the need for replacement dwellings to reflect the vernacular style and landscape context of the parish. Overall, Eastchurch Parish Council agrees with the preamble and considers it clear and appropriate, subject to minor emphasis on safeguarding rural identity and cumulative impact.		
2026Reg18/105	17	Question 036 Do you support or object to Policy E2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Creative Estuary				Neither	(See attached document) E1-4 Economy Include the creative and cultural industries in place-making development particularly around transport hubs, new estates, and high street developments. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Question 34, 36, 38 and 40
2026Reg18/121	5	Question 036 Do you support or object to Policy E2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Kent Wildlife Trust				Neither	Development in rural locations has the capacity to detrimentally impact on biodiversity and result in a loss of green infrastructure that plays an important role in nature connectivity at a landscape scale. While the wording of the policy and its explanatory text generally seeks to avoid these impacts, it is our view that Policy E1(d) and E2(d) should be amended to read "result in no significant harm to the [...] biodiversity [...] of the area". It is also our view that Part 3 of the policy should support the sustainable growth and expansion of agricultural and forestry sectors to enable regenerative agroecological practices (including agroforestry) where appropriate.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Supports this pre-amble for the following reasons that it is sets out a balanced approach and with the principles of residents being allowed to extend or replace dwelling with the appropriate considerations. Seeks additions to the pre-amble as follows: Reinforcing the importance of protecting rural character and avoiding incremental suburbanisation of the countryside; Emphasising that cumulative extensions over time should be carefully assessed to prevent disproportionate enlargement of original dwellings; and Highlighting the need for replacement dwellings to reflect the vernacular style and landscape context of the parish.	The Council partial agrees to the preamble additions in that the third bullet point should be amended a more general area rather than stated parish. The bullet points in the submission to be included towards the end of the Policy H8 preamble as a sentences rather than bullet points. Reinforcing the importance of protecting rural character and avoiding incremental suburbanisation of the countryside; Emphasising that cumulative extensions over time should be carefully assessed to prevent disproportionate enlargement of original dwellings; and Highlighting the need for replacement dwellings to reflect the vernacular style and landscape context of an area Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/105	Requests that the creative and cultural industries are included in place-making development, particularly around transport hubs, new estates, and high street developments.	Reference to this will be added to Strategic Policy ST5 Building a strong, competitive economy at the next stage of the Local Plan, Reg 19. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/121	Neither supports nor objects to this policy. States that development in rural locations has the capacity to detrimentally impact on biodiversity and result in a loss of green infrastructure that plays an important role in nature connectivity at a landscape scale. Notes that the wording of the policy and its explanatory text generally seeks to avoid these impacts, request that that Policy E1(d) and E2(d) should be amended to read "result in no significant harm to the [...] biodiversity [...] of the area". States that Part 3 of the policy should support the sustainable growth and expansion of agricultural and forestry sectors to enable regenerative agroecological practices (including agroforestry) where appropriate.	Noted. Noted. Point 1d of the policy uses the suggested wording already "result in no significant harm to the historical, architectural, biodiversity, landscape or rural character of the area;" already. The Council agrees that the suggested wording would add value to the policy and it will be added to part 3 of the policy. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	14	Question 036 Do you support or object to Policy E2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Development Investment TeamThe County Council recommends specific mention of access to, from and between tourism sites within the policy to assist with the realisation of the Council's tourism objectives.Tourism is an important industry for Kent and the landscape is a key attractor of visitors – sustainable tourism is a way of supporting rural areas, providing jobs and supporting community services and local economies. The PROW network and the ROWIP have a critical role in this; for example, promoted walking routes have been variously developed within the borough, including the King Charles III England Coast Path, the Saxon Shore Way and several 'Food Trails'.
2026Reg18/127	13	Question 040 Do you support or object to Policy E4? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.5.2 E4 New Holiday Parks or extensions to existing parks & the occupancy of holiday parks2.5.2.1 Policy criteriaNatural England supports this policy and its reference to policies C6 and C7 relating to the coast and the coastal change management area in criterion 2a.We note that the policy includes an additional criterion 2g related to impacts to the local environment. We advise that the Draft Plan has overarching policies related to impacts to the natural environment. We refer you to our overarching comments in paragraph 2.1. It would be Natural England's preference to remove criterion 2g from policy E4 and rely on strong overarching policies in the Draft Plan. Should the Council choose to not to rely on the overarching policies and to include criterion 2g, we advise that a link could instead be made to relevant overarching policies such as Policy B1 and any others the Council deems relevant. We would suggest the following wording, and advise that this should be included in all other relevant policies as well as added to criterion 3 of this policy for consistency. We would suggest the following wording:"2. In circumstances where land is lost to coastal erosion, minor extensions to existing static holiday caravan sites will be permitted where...g. there is no unacceptable impact on the local environment, in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG...3. Where new or improved facilities are proposed within the existing boundaries of the Holiday Park areas, as shown on the Proposals Map (to be illustrated in later stages of the Local Plan), planning permission will be granted provided they are...d. in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG."We support criterion 4d of this policy related to potential disturbance to over-wintering birds of Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Our understanding is that the criterion relates to the need for appropriate financial contributions to be made to the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS) to mitigate recreational disturbance from developments within the 6 km zone of influence of the SPAs. If this is the case, we suggest that the wording is amended to make this clearer and suggest the following wording:4. Applications to extend

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	The respondent recommends specific mention of access to, from and between tourism sites within the policy to assist with the realisation of the Council's tourism objectives. Sustainable tourism is a way of supporting rural areas, providing jobs and supporting community services and local economies and the PROW network and the ROWIP have a critical role in this.	The Council agrees that access to, from and between is important. The pre-amble references the business credentials of rural tourism and this includes "the transport opportunities and choices available." Point 2a of the policy requires applicants to reference these principles. The Council proposes adding wording to paragraph 19.0.9: "the transport opportunities and choices available and access to, from and between tourism sites." Noted. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/127	1. Neither supports or objects to this policy 2. Comments that the Draft Plan has overarching policies related to impacts to the natural environment 3. Seeks amendment to criteria 2.g to include reference to Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG 4. Seek amendment to an additional criteria to 3 as 3.d in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG." 5. Seeks to amendment to criteria 4d to reference 6km zone of influence of the SPA to reads as where located within 6 km of adjacent to or in close proximity of the North Kent Special Protection Areas (SPAs), an assessment has been undertaken to determine the level of disturbance to over-wintering birds and identified mitigation measures, including securing financial contribution to the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMMS), where appropriate"	1. Noted 2. the Regulation 19 Local Plan will have strategic policies that will cover a range of over arching matters 3. Proposed change to criteria 2.g to include reference to Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG 4. Proposed change to additional criteria to 3 as 3.d in accordance with Policy B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNG." 5. Proposed change to criteria 4d to reference 6km zone of influence of the SPA to reads as where located within 6 km of adjacent to or in close proximity of the North Kent Special Protection Areas (SPAs),

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/62	28	Question 041 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Maidstone Borough Council			Maidstone Borough Council is unclear as to why Department for Transport Circular 1/2022 Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development has not been mentioned in the preamble as this sets a new vision led approach to the transport planning. on a similar note, has Kent County Council's 2025 guidance on Transport Assessment & Travel Plan been considered as part of the policy development? The Council is also keen to understand the outcomes of the transport modelling for the proposed new local plan so that it can understand the impacts of the proposals on the highway network within its own borough boundary.		
2026Reg18/74	13	Question 041 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	We acknowledge Faversham Council's Active Travel Committee's views and support their opinion in relation to the Reg 18 document that: "there is an urgent need to prioritise sustainable transport and active travel and the transport hierarchy proposed. Reference to Faversham LCWIP out of date. Town Council signed off revised version Autumn 2024."We also support the Active Travel Committee's suggestions as follows: "(Para 22.0.20) Development proposals should incorporate 20mph speed limits to reduce traffic speeds in residential areas. Schemes must provide for walking, wheeling and cycling through well-designed site layouts and continuous, coherent links to the wider active-travel network, services and facilities. Transport Assessments and Travel Plans will be rigorously evaluated against these requirements.(Para 22.0.22) Developer contributions may support new or enhanced public transport services. Policies should acknowledge the current inadequacy of bus provision and set expectations for minimum service levels, recognising that bus use is strongly dependent on service availability and frequency." Their meeting records can be found on FTC's website.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/62	Gives qualified support for this preamble for the following reasons: Unclear how Transport Circular 1/2022Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development and Kent County Council's 2025 guidance on Transport Assessment & Travel Plan been considered as part of the policy development? Council is also keen to understand the outcomes of the transport modelling for the proposed new local plan.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: The documents will be referenced and incorporated as part of the strategic policy on transport at the Reg 19 stage of plan making. Transport modelling is being prepared and will be made public for Reg 19 local plan consultation. Change proposed
2026Reg18/74	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: urgent need to prioritise sustainable transport and active travel and the transport hierarchy proposed. Reference to Faversham LCWIP out of date. Town Council signed off revised version Autumn 2024. Development proposals should incorporate 20mph speed limits to reduce traffic speeds in residential areas. Schemes must provide for walking, wheeling and cycling through well-designed site layouts and continuous, coherent links to the wider active-travel network, services and facilities Policies should acknowledge the current inadequacy of bus provision and set expectations for minimum service levels	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted This will be changed and updated. Speed limit is evidence - led and is set by local traffic authorities based on local needs and conditions. KCC is the primary traffic authority in Kent and determines this. Noted Noted, this is considered as part of the Infrastructure delivery plan Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/76	40	Question 041 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			FPG commend the preamble, which clearly describes the local plan principles for managing transport demand and impact. We particularly support paragraph 22.0.24 which indicates the Council's intent for the local plan's policies to accommodate new adaptations to the way we travel, work and shop. This policy should be aligned with Kent County Council as they are the Highways authority acting for Swale.Perhaps through the use of new technologies the recently withdrawn bus services to rural villages can be replaced by new flexible low-cost services in the not-too-distant future. Such a service may be more appealing to passengers of all ages, increasing demand and success in Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel, with all the environmental benefits that will accrue. For example, reductions in congestion, emissions and pollution, harm from cars used for short journeys, (such as to Doctors, Supermarkets, Libraries, etc.). Please note we are not endorsing a busway which was part of the Highsted South application this was a complete red herring and a “novel mode” of transport that has no national design standards and most terrifyingly was implemented in Cambridgeshire with little consideration of the design during planning of the service – this resulted in several deaths as this novel transport mode did not include sufficient health and safety standards – it resulted in the local authority being prosecuted and paying a fine of £6m. Therefore any new provision must adhere to national design standards and be demonstrated to have a track record of safe delivery/provision. After this was pointed out by us at the public inquiry the desire for a busway rapidly evaporated!Swale needs to align itself with Kent County Council Bus Service Improvement Plan and in addition how to release the Section 106 funding received back into the community in a timely manner. An example of this is with Stones Farm where none of the Section 106 monies have been released and Bus Services have gone from 4 services an hour to 1 service. There are also no bus services on a Sunday (Service X3) between Sittingbourne and Maidstone or Sittingbourne and Canterbury.Paragraph 22.0.25 is a clear statement which the FPG fully support. During the Highsted Park Inquiry there was no evidence presented regarding		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/76	Gives qualified support for this preamble for the following reasons: Preamble clearly describes the local principles for managing transport demand and impact highlighting council's intent to accommodate new ways of travel. Recently withdrawn bus services to rural villages can be replaced by new flexible low-cost services in the not-too-distant future. Should noted that busway which was part of the Highsted South application is not endorsed Swale needs to align itself with Kent County Council Bus Service Improvement Plan and in addition how to release the Section 106 funding received back into the community in a timely manner. Supports Paragraph 22.0.25 Focus should be on delivering improved rail and bus infrastructure Policy INF1 makes no mention of rail freight - it only mentions freight (ie lorries). It is important that Swale includes policies to replace key infrastructure such the rail bridges on Crown Quay Lane and Milton Road. Policies should be included in the local plan to deliver this improvements.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted Noted Noted The bus service improvement plan has been considered for the IDP and will be reflected in the document. Noted Noted In 22.0.23 the council acknowledges the importance of rail in the movement of freight. The IDP will capture and itemise the infrastructure required to support the development envisioned in the plan including priorities and timeline of delivery. No Change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	2	Question 041 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning	Highways and Transport The County Council, as the Local Highway Authority (LHA), recognises the continued need to ensure that the transport network is safe, resilient, and capable of supporting future growth.The County Council considers that the Regulation 18 document shows positive progress, particularly in relation to active travel, sustainable mobility and the embedding of climate considerations into transport planning. However, several areas require further clarification, strengthening or evidence ahead of the Regulation 19 stage.It is therefore considered that:•Evidence is still incomplete and key modelling and infrastructure planning work must be delivered before the County Council can fully support the Plan.•The completion of strategic transport modelling to test all reasonable growth scenarios is requested.•Evidence that the development strategy avoids severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.•The County Council would like to emphasise that the Plan must ultimately show how development will be supported by a coordinated package of transport improvements that align with both local and strategic transport priorities in Kent.•The Local Plan will require a more detailed, fully costed and deliverable transport strategy at Regulation 19 stage including a robust and fully costed Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).•The County Council is committed to working collaboratively with SBC to ensure that development is supported by a safe, sustainable and well-functioning transport network. In addition to the above the County Council undertakes regular HGV overnight parking surveys across Kent and Medway. Our most recent survey (September 2025) showed that Swale is the borough with the highest average number of HGVs parking overnight outside of official lorry parking facilities (which is considered inappropriate parking). The average was 134 HGVs, with Ashford being second highest at 49. A comparable result was found in the June 2025 survey and since the survey began in 2017, it has been Swale with the highest number of HGVs inappropriately parked. Within Swale, the most highly affected areas were the Furlink Industrial Estate and Trinity Trading Estate in		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: Reg 18 document shows positive progress particularly around active travel, sustainable mobility and climate consideration into transport planning. Evidence incomplete - Modelling and Infrastructure Evidence that development avoids residual cumulative impact, coordinated package of transport improvement aligning with local and strategic priorities. Detailed costed IDP. Committed to working with SBC In Recent HGV survey Swale highest in average number of HGVs parking overnight outside of official lorry parking facilities, affecting Eurolink Industrial Estate and Trinity Trading Estate in Sittingbourne, Queenborough on the Isle of Sheppey and laybys on the A249 and A2/A299 corridors. Policy should address this. Protect public right of way Objective 6 can limit application of Active Travel The Rights-of-Way-Improvement-Plan-2018-2028.pdf will be Included future development proposals will need to be mindful of the NPPF	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: Work is being undertaken on this will be available at the next stage of plan making. Noted Noted Noted To be considered INF1 part 3e applies to this INF1 part 3 makes it clear this applies to all trip generating proposal to be included Include Rights-of-Way-Improvement-Plan-2018-2028.pdf Noted Change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	16	Question 042 Do you support or object to Policy INF1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Policy INF1 – Managing Transport Demand and Impact Highways and TransportationThe County Council considers that Policy INF1 forms the backbone of the Local Plan's transport strategy. The County Council supports its principles but considers that the policy should be strengthened in several areas. Transport Assessment RequirementsThe Plan correctly references the use of Transport Statements (TS) and Transport Assessments (TA). However, the County Council requires: •Confirmation that all TAs must be scoped with the County Council at the pre-application stage to ensure consistency of approach and robust technical outputs. •Explicit reference to the need for cumulative assessment, incorporating committed development, planned growth, and background traffic growth. •A requirement for developments that may impact the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to engage both the County Council and National Highways at an early stage. Strategic Transport ModellingThe County Council notes that a bespoke transport model is being prepared to test Local Plan growth. The County Council must emphasise: •Modelling must be completed before Regulation 19 so that the draft Local Plan includes a justified and deliverable transport strategy. •Scenario testing must reflect a range of assumptions on mode share, active travel uptake, and public transport viability. •Outputs must clearly identify pinch points, mitigation packages, costs, and responsible delivery agencies. •The County Council will not be able to support the Local Plan at Regulation 19 without this evidence. Active Travel ImprovementsThe County Council welcomes the emphasis on walking, cycling and wheeling and agrees that the LCWIPs (Faversham, Kent-wide, and emerging Swale-wide) should inform infrastructure delivery. To strengthen deliverability: •Active travel schemes should be mapped, prioritised and costed within the IDP. •Policy should highlight that connections to schools, town centres and rail stations are particularly critical. •Developers should be required to demonstrate continuous, direct, safe and attractive active travel connections into surrounding networks, not only within site boundaries. The

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Supports this policy for the following reasons: supports the interface between Policies INF1/INF2 and the climate/air quality policies (C1-C12). Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: Confirmation that all TAs must be scoped with the County Council at the pre-application stage to ensure consistency of approach and robust technical outputs. Explicit reference to the need for cumulative assessment, incorporating committed development, planned growth, and background traffic growth. A requirement for developments that may impact the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to engage both the County Council and National Highways at an early stage. Active travel schemes should be mapped, prioritised and costed within the IDP. Policy should highlight that connections to schools, town centres and rail stations are particularly critical. Developers should be required to demonstrate continuous, direct, safe and attractive active travel connections into surrounding networks, not only within site boundaries. The County Council encourages the Plan to reference Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN 1/20) more explicitly to ensure active travel facilities meet national standards. The Local Plan should identify corridors with the greatest potential for enhanced bus frequency, bus priority or demand-responsive transport. The viability of extending existing routes or creating new ones must be tested through modelling and discussions with operators. Larger developments should be required to provide mobility hubs incorporating bus stops, shared mobility modes, EV charging and cycle parking. Growth allocations that may materially increase flows on the SRN must be supported by evidence agreed with National Highways. Opportunities to enhance junction capacity must be assessed early, including M2 J5, A249 and key junctions on the A2 corridor. The Local Plan should explicitly safeguard key freight corridors and wharves serving the Port of Sheerness and wider Thames Estuary area. Industrial and logistics proposals must include an HGV routing strategy demonstrating how sensitive locations will be avoided. reference the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan's freight principles. Air Quality, Climate Change and Transport	Noted The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: to ensure consistency of approach and robust technical outputs. it is proposed that for item 1 of the policy include: All transport assessments must be scoped with the county council at the pre-application stage. Proposed to wording for item 1: should include cumulative impact on on the transport network Proposed to include in Item 2: and an early stage engagement with Kent County Council highway an National Highways. Noted Noted Proposed to include item 3 i : Ensuring continuous and safe active travel connections into surrounding networks, not only within site boundaries. Noted - policy already covers relevant aspect. Noted Noted The council is currently preparing additional evidence work including transport modelling in support of the plan. Noted Noted Wharfs HGV Strategy The Kent minirals and waste Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	15	Question 042 Do you support or object to Policy INF1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	Natural England supports this policy which highlights the need to prioritise sustainable and active travel in the preamble.2.6.1.2 Policy criteria We welcome the inclusion of criterion 3 which reflects the requirements for all trip generating development proposals to prioritise sustainable and active travel, including criterion 3e to ensure existing public rights of way are enhanced.By way of clarification, we recommend including reference to National Trails and the King Charles III England Coast Path and specifically, a requirement to consider adding links to such existing routes, to ensure the policy aligns with NPPF paragraph 105. We would also like to clarify that this criterion should apply to all development proposals rather than just trip generating development proposals. We therefore suggest including an additional criterion to apply to all development proposals, and suggest the following wording:"8. All development proposals should protect and enhance existing public rights of way, including National Trails and the King Charles III England Coast Path, to improve connectivity to the wider network and take opportunities to support biodiversity through enhancing green corridors"Transport infrastructure also provides opportunities to enhance biodiversity, for example through the creation of biodiverse highway verges, which should be recognised and promoted. We therefore suggest that an additional policy criterion could be added and suggest the following wording: "9. All development proposals should promote and support opportunities to create and enhance green and blue infrastructure and create and connect habitats in the transport network in accordance with Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework standards."
2026Reg18/15	4	Question 045 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or				Sport England	Bob	Sharples	The reference to the playing pitch strategy is confusing - we have 2025-2040 version of an action plan, which was published in October 2025.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: Inclusion of criterion for all trip generating development proposals to prioritise sustainable and active travel and ensuring enhancement of public right of way. Seeks amendment of this policy as follows: Include additional criteria: All development proposals should protect and enhance existing public rights of way, including National Trails and the King Charles III England Coast Path, to improve connectivity to the wider network and take opportunities to support biodiversity through enhancing green corridors. All development proposals should promote and support opportunities to create and enhance green and blue infrastructure and create and connect habitats in the transport network in accordance with Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework standards.	Noted Include additional criteria: The Council agrees for the following reasons: Amendment is In line with the NPPF. The Council disagrees for the following reasons: Repeats Policy B1 Biodiversity& Geodiversity conservation & BNGItem 6 Partial Change Proposed. Inclusion of new Criterion 3i 3i. All development proposals should protect and enhance existing public rights of way, including National Trails and the King Charles III England Coast Path, to improve connectivity to the wider network and take opportunities to support biodiversity through enhancing green corridors.
2026Reg18/15	reference to the playing pitch strategy is confusing - as there is 2025-2040 version of an action plan	This will be updated in the version of the plan, the Reg 18 version was published shortly before the latest playing pitch strategy was published. Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	16	Question 046 Do you support or object to Policy INF3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.6.2 INF3 Open space, sport and recreation provision 2.6.2.1 Policy criteria Natural England welcomes this policy which supports paragraphs 88d and 98a of the NPPF in relation to open space provision. We particularly welcome the inclusion of provision targets (including green space) and the commitment to providing multi-use of open space and recreation facilities "with particular emphasis on contributing towards the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (2020)" as stated in criterion 5. We welcome the intention to strengthen the requirement to use the recommendations within the GBI Strategy, by the inclusion of a supporting strategic policy within the next Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan Review, as stated in criterion 5. We would also support the use of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework in open space, sports and recreation facilities proposals and suggest that criterion 5 is strengthened to include this with the following wording:"5. Provide for the multi-use of open space, sports and recreation facilities as appropriate, in accordance with Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework and with particular emphasis on contributing towards the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (2020)122 , set out in a strategic policy in the next stage of the Local Plan Review, Regulation 19, so as to achieve benefits for both communities and biodiversity."
2026Reg18/16	17	Question 049 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	§ 1a In 'upgrading existing structures may be more sustainable than building new.' substitute 'may'with 'is generally'???Why not require BREEAM 'Excellent'?		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: supports paragraphs 88d and 98a of the NPPF and welcome the inclusion of provision targets (including green space) and the commitment to providing multi-use of open space and recreation facilities welcome the intention to strengthen the requirement to use the recommendations within the GBI Strategy, by the inclusion of a supporting strategic policy within the next Regulation 19 We would also support the use of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework in open space, sports and recreation facilities proposals. Seeks deletion/amendment of this policy/pre-amble as follows: in accordance with Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework and	Noted Noted Noted The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Includes NR Framework in policy Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/16	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Suggests word change: 1a In 'upgrading existing structures may be more sustainable than building new.' substitute 'may'with 'is generally' Why not require BREEAM 'Excellent'?	The Council (partially) agrees, as follows: Agree. 'May' will be amended to 'generally' in C1, point 1a. BREEAM 'Excellent' is required in policy C1 where viable. Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/40	76	Question 050 Do you support or object to Policy C1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC support Policy C1. The wording of the two opening paragraphs would be stronger if the word "should" is replaced with "must" and it was indicated that such documentation will be assessed for all applications. We do not have the expertise to question the rating or assessment systems identified for large/major developments but our brief investigation of them leads us to support their use. It would be helpful to define what are large/major developments (reading ahead it seems to be developments of 50 units or more?), and where these systems are required to be used or is it best left to planning officers to decide (with decision scrutiny)? Will the proposed Planning Guidance set out more detail about what constitutes a large development and the systems applicable?
2026Reg18/76	49	Question 050 Do you support or object to Policy C1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Opposition Group				Support	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG support Policy C1. The wording of the two opening paragraphs would be stronger if the word "should" is replaced with "must" and it was indicated that such documentation will be assessed for all applications. We do not have the expertise to question the rating or assessment systems identified for large/major developments but our brief investigation of them leads us to support their use. It would be helpful to define what are large/major developments (reading ahead it seems to be developments of 50 units or more?), and where these systems are required to be used or is it best left to planning officers to decide (with decision scrutiny)? Will the proposed Planning Guidance set out more detail about what constitutes a large development and the systems applicable?

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/40	Gives qualified support for this policy, with comments: Would be stronger if word 'should' is replaced with 'must'. Make clear that documentation is required for all applications Define what large/major developments are/where systems are to be used (will this be set out in Planning Guidance?)	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Agree. It is clear from the opening paragraph of C1 that the criteria set out are 'a requirement'. However, 'should' will be replaced with 'must' or 'will'. Policy C1 makes clear that all residential and non-residential schemes will require a Climate, Energy and Waste Statement. Agree. The definitions of large and major development will be added to the glossary, as follows: Minor development: includes between 1 and 9 dwellings/ covers up to and including 0.5 hectares/ commercial development less than 1,000 square metres. Major development: includes 10-49 dwellings/ from 0.51 hectares up to and including 2 hectares/ commercial development between, 1000 and 4,999 square metres. Large major development: includes 50-249 dwellings/ from 2.1 hectares up to and including 5 hectares/ commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres. For information, Strategic major development: includes 250+ dwellings/ covers more than 5 hectares/ commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more- Definitions of large and major development will be added to the glossary, as follows: Minor development: includes between 1 and 9 dwellings/ covers up to and including 0.5 hectares/ commercial development less than 1,000 square metres. Major development: includes 10-49 dwellings/ from 0.51 hectares up to and including 2 hectares/ commercial development between, 1000 and 4,999 square metres. Large major development: includes 50-249 dwellings/ from 2.1 hectares up to and including 5 hectares/ commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres. For information, Strategic major development: includes 250+ dwellings/ covers more than 5 hectares/ commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/76	Gives qualified support, with comments: In two opening paragraphs 'should' should be amended to 'must'. Define what large/major developments are. Questions if Planning Guidance will set out more detail about scale of development and applicable systems?	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Agree. It is clear from the opening paragraph of C1 that the criteria set out are 'a requirement'. However, 'should' will be replaced with 'must' or 'will'. Definitions of scales of development will be added to the glossary, as follows: Minor development: includes between 1 and 9 dwellings/ covers up to and including 0.5 hectares/ commercial development less than 1,000 square metres. Major development: includes 10-49 dwellings/ from 0.51 hectares up to and including 2 hectares/ commercial development between, 1000 and 4,999 square metres. Large major development: includes 50-249 dwellings/ from 2.1 hectares up to and including 5 hectares/ commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres. For information, Strategic major development: includes 250+ dwellings/ covers more than 5 hectares/ commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more See point 2. above. The Council aims to produce Planning Guidance to assist in interpretation and application. Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	20	Question 050 Do you support or object to Policy C1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Support	Policy C1 – Sustainable Design and Adaptation Principles Energy and AdaptationThe County Council would ask SBC to consider providing a hyperlink to the Swale Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plan where mentioned. The County Council strongly supports this policy overall and is pleased to see how thoroughly adaptation has been considered – particularly for overheating risk.The County Council would, however, make the following comments:Point 1a: consider defining ‘carbon footprint’ and whether this includes lifecycle and/or operational emissions (and/or refer to the detail in Policy C4). SBC could also consider defining ‘fabric first’, perhaps in the glossary, to indicate the value of sufficient insulation and window glazing ahead of, or complementary to, technology such as solar PV, battery storage and heat pumps.Point 1(c): The County Council would agree with the requirement to set out within a Climate, Energy and Waste Statement how overheating risk measures have been incorporated in accordance with the cooling hierarchy. This policy will ensure that passive measures are prioritised, reducing energy consumption and the statement will ensure compliance with this requirement.Point 1(d) – The County Council supports the requirement for developments to complete CIBSE TM59 as opposed to the Simplified Method in Part O of the Building Regulations as this provides a more robust assessment of overheating risk and will enable more resilient residential buildings. Similarly, the County Council supports the requirement for the CIBSE TM52 to be completed for non-residential buildings.Point 1(e): The County Council is pleased to see reference to other relevant policies regarding flood risk, water resources and SuDS, as well as nature-based solutions. Sub-point (v) could potentially benefit from being moved to other areas of the policy. It is suggested that the water elements are either included in, or placed next to, the sub-point (i) and that reference to the changing climate conditions is listed/merged with the beginning text of this point (e). Additionally, it is strongly agreed that this should be a requirement for all developments.
2026Reg18/127	18	Question 050 Do you support or object to Policy C1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Support	2.7 Climate Change, Pollution & The Water Environment2.7.1 C1 Sustainable design and adaptation principles2.7.1.1 Policy criteriaNatural England supports this policy. In regard to the policy criteria, we agree with most of the wording and only suggest that under e. Resilience and adaptation to climate change point iii. could be strengthened with the following wording:"Ensure cool streets and paths, through green & blue infrastructure (such as tree planting) and nature-based solutions, including the enhancement of existing water features".

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Supports this policy, with comments: Include hyperlinks to Swale Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plan where mentioned. Pleased how thoroughly adaptation has been consider, especially overheating (Climate, Energy and Waste Statement). Define 'carbon footprint' and include 'fabric first' further in policy or glossary. Supports the requirement for developments to complete CIBSE TM59 as opposed to the Simplified Method in Part O of the Building Regulations as this provides a more robust assessment of overheating risk and will enable more resilient residential buildings. Similarly supports the requirement for the CIBSE TM52 to be completed for non-residential buildings. Welcomes reference to flood risk, water resources, SuDs and nature-based solutions in policy. Suggests minor reordering of 1(e), but agrees should be requirement for all development. Welcomes reference to sustainable choices for travel and emphasises importance of Public Rights of Way. Questions omission of policy on 'Health and Well being'.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted - hyperlinks have been included throughout the document. This will be checked again when the next iteration of the draft Local Plan is proof-read. Noted Agreed. Definitions will be added to glossary, as follows Fabric-first: An approach which focuses on enhancing a building's physical fabric (including insulation and window glazing), ahead of advanced technologies and renewable energy systems (such as solar PV, battery storage and heat pumps). Carbon Footprint: the total amount of greenhouse gases, primarily carbon dioxide, emitted by an individual, organisation or product (eg a building) or activity. Noted. Noted. The benefits of reordering this section are not clear so no change is proposed. Noted. Noted. It is intended that Health and Well-being will be a Strategic Policy in the forthcoming Regulation 19 Local Plan. Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/127	Supports this policy, with comments: Strengthen policy at 1.e.iii with inclusion of reference to green & blue infrastructure.	Supports this policy, with comments: Strengthen policy at 1.e.iii with inclusion of reference to green & blue infrastructure. The Council agrees, as follows: Amend 1.e.iii: 'Ensure cool streets and paths,through green and blue infrastructure (such astree planting)and nature-based solutions, including the enhancement of existing water features. Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/34	19	Question 052 Do you support or object to Policy C2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Croudace Homes	Emily	Comber		Object	Firstly, Croudace Homes supports and acknowledges the need to reduce carbon emissions, particularly in the context of the UK's legally binding target of net zero carbon by 2050 and acknowledging the forthcoming Future Homes and Building Standards. The principle of improving the energy efficiency and environmental performance of new homes is therefore fully supported. However, the specific requirements set out in Policy C2 are highly ambitious and may present practical challenges for developers and deliverability, particularly on complex sites or smaller schemes. It is therefore recommended that the policy include flexibility for site specific circumstances and alternative compliance mechanisms where the targets are exceptionally difficult to meet. Such an approach would help ensure that the policy remains deliverable, viable, and supportive of sustainable development across the borough. The policy further contains on site annual renewable energy generation capacity that is equal to the predicted annual total energy use. This is also overly prescriptive for certain types of development. The installation of effective solar generation will not be feasible for every site, for example due to orientation and site size, or due to heritage considerations. In these circumstances it may not be possible to achieve a net zero operational energy balance. Finally, fixing an energy offset price at £2.31/kWh within the policy is problematic, as the policy itself acknowledges that this figure will need to be revised annually. It would therefore be more appropriate for the policy to be reworded to allow for flexibility over time, rather than embedding a fixed sum within the Local Plan which is likely to become outdated.
2026Reg18/74	19	Question 052 Do you support or object to Policy C2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society		Object	Some elements here are strong and very specific about what must be done; others are weaker and relapse into the language of "should." The latter should be strengthened wherever possible so that they are requirements.
2026Reg18/16	18	Question 055 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	Should there be a presumption that buildings will be re-used instead of demolished full-stop –something that RIBA has long advocated. Existing policy DM 19 (c) recognises that retrofitting offers a more sustainable option than redevelopment so this would mark a logical next step consistent with the Council's net zero aspirations.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/34	Objects to this policy for the following reasons: Acknowledges need to reduce carbon emissions and supports the principle of improving energy efficiency and environmental performance. However, requirements of C2 present challenges to delivery, particularly for small/complex sites. Policy should be adjusted to include flexibility. Requirement for on site annual renewable energy generation to equal predicted total annual energy use is over prescriptive for some sites. Including energy offset price within policy is problematic as it will need to be revised annually.	The Council disagrees for the following reasons: Noted. It is welcome that this comment implies that the requirements of C2 are considered achievable for all but small and complex sites. The complexity of small and complex sites can be discussed on a case by case basis at the planning application stage. The requirement for energy use to be met by energy generation on site is a fundamental aspiration of the climate change policies in the Local Plan document. However, in exceptional circumstances, offsetting will be acceptable. Agreed. Reference to the offset price will remain in the policy but detail will be moved to the preamble. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/74	Objects to this policy for the following reasons: Make language strong and consistent - use 'must' rather than 'should'.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: The inconsistency is noted, across this and other policies in the Regulation 18 document. This will be reviewed and amended where necessary for the Regulation 19 Document. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/16	Comments on the preamble as follows: Should there be a presumption that buildings will be re-used instead of demolished? Existing policy DM 19 (c) recognises that retrofitting offers a more sustainable option than redevelopment so this would mark a logical next step consistent with the Council's net zero aspirations.	Noted. Policy C1 will be amended to encourage retention rather than demolition where this is the more sustainable choice. A brief explanation of the benefits of retrofitting versus demolition and rebuilding will be added to the preamble to C4. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	35	Question 055 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	Eastchurch Parish Council agrees with the intent and direction of the preamble and supports the inclusion of embodied carbon and waste within the Local Plan. The justification is strong and clearly linked to national carbon budgets, the Climate Change Act 2008, and Swale's declared Climate and Ecological Emergency. To make the preamble more focussed, relatable and complete, the Parish Council suggests the following refinements: 1. Strengthen the Local Context Whilst the national and international context is well set out, the preamble would benefit from clearer reference to: The scale of development proposed across Swale during the plan period; The cumulative embodied carbon impact of new housing and commercial growth; The specific vulnerability of coastal communities to climate change impacts. Making the link between embodied carbon and local development pressures would help communities understand why this policy is necessary now. 2. Clarify the Practical Purpose The preamble could more clearly explain that: Measuring embodied carbon is the first step towards reducing it; Early-stage design decisions (retention, reuse, material choice) have the greatest impact; Demolition and rebuild often carry significantly higher embodied carbon than retrofit. This would help applicants and residents see that the policy is about better design, not just additional paperwork. 3. Emphasise Reuse and Retrofit Greater emphasis could be placed on: Retention and retrofit of existing buildings where feasible; Adaptive reuse of rural and agricultural structures; Designing buildings for longevity and adaptability. In rural areas, reuse of existing buildings is often more sustainable than new.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Comments on the preamble as follows: Agrees with intent and justification. Strengthen local context (including vulnerability of coastal communities) and link between development pressures. Clarify practical purpose (measure first, early-stage design, retrofit first) Emphasise reuse and retrofit. Make waste policy more accessible (plain language, cost savings and supply chain resilience, on site recycling) Reassure small applicants that requirements are scaled appropriately. Link to Circular Economy (concept, design for disassembly and material recovery, local sourcing).	Noted - Noted - Noted - Noted - an additional comment about reuse/retrofitting will be added to preamble. Noted - This is already covered in 29.0.16. Noted - a reference to the Circular Economy will be added to preamble. Partial Change Agreed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	37	Question 056 Do you support or object to Policy C4? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	Eastchurch Parish Council supports the principle and overall direction of Policy C4. Reducing embodied carbon and construction waste is necessary if Swale is to meet its carbon reduction commitments and respond effectively to the Climate and Ecological Emergency. However, the Parish Council has significant concerns regarding ongoing illegal waste activities at two sites within Eastchurch. Whilst this policy focuses on construction waste and embodied carbon, it should also recognise the real impacts that waste mismanagement and unlawful operations have on rural communities. To strengthen the policy and address local concerns, the following amendments and additions are suggested: 1. Stronger Reference to Waste Enforcement and Prevention The policy could include wording that: Confirms that waste arising from development must be managed in accordance with environmental permitting and waste regulations; States that development must not facilitate unlawful waste activities; Requires clear site management plans for construction waste handling, storage and removal. Given the existing illegal waste problems in Eastchurch, stronger preventative wording would provide reassurance to communities. 2. Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) For major developments, the policy could require: A Construction Environmental Management Plan that includes waste handling, storage, transport routes and monitoring;
2026Reg18/3	57	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more				Dunkirk Parish Council			Support. But this is based on 2008 climate change act. Surely there should be a more up to date document to use.		
2026Reg18/14	25	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Town Council			'Policy C5 Renewable energy development and infrastructure' includes a number of clauses including dealing with cumulative impacts and wider impacts in particular clause 1,bViii should be updated to include vibration to the list that currently reads 'noise, dust, odour, air quality, tranquillity, shadow flicker'. The policy does not currently address restoring a landscape or agricultural land. This may be appropriate in cases on greenfield sites.		
The clause relating to co-benefits for communities is welcomed. Any application should be clear and transparent on the value of these contributions and allow sufficient period for communities to reasonably raise the funds.											

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified support for the policy: Issues is important in context of climate emergency, however concerns around illegal waste activities in Eastchurch. Issue of waste mismanagement has an impact on rural communities. Ask for stronger reference to waste enforcement and prevention, including clear site plans for construction waste and request for Construction Environmental Management Plans for major developments and details of licensed carriers and recycling facilities. Cross reference to transport and amenity policies to ensure waste movements are acceptable. Clarification on demolition and site clearance. Eg time limits for storage of demolition waste. Supports circular economy principles. Supports proportionality for smaller sites.	Noted - Noted - An additional point on sound management of waste on sites and disposal will be added to C4 and the preamble. Noted - An additional point on sound management of waste on sites and disposal will be added to C4 and the preamble. Noted - An additional point on sound management of waste on sites and disposal will be added to C4 and the preamble. Noted - Noted - Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/3	Support preamble but request update to 2008 Climate Change Act.	Agree. Reference to 2050 Target Amendment will be added to preamble. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/14	Vibration should be added to clause 1b.viii Welcomes clause on co-benefits. Applications should be clear on detail.	Agreed. Vibration will be added to 1b.viii Noted. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/16	19	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	§ 2a. Substitute 'encouraged' with 'should??' NESO announced in December that it was removing speculative energy projects so-called 'zombie' solar farms from the grid connection queue. § 4 Consider reinstating from DM 20 the following: 'where schemes are demonstrated as necessary on agricultural land, that they explore options for continued agricultural use' Should solar panels be installed on rooftops – especially on public and commercial buildings – or above car parks as a priority. Should areas of landscape sensitivity or of importance to biodiversity be protected from industrial solar developments.		
2026Reg18/31	40	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent	CPRE campaigns for rooftop renewables and has been one of the driving forces behind the government announcing plans for all new-build homes to be fitted with solar panels from 2027 under the Future Homes Standard. However, we remain concerned about the loss of countryside (including generational loss of best and most versatile agricultural land) in relation to ground-mounted solar farms, as well as the impact this has on the landscape. The plan provides no guidelines as to the siting of such development, which should as a minimum be steered away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas. Specific reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (cross-referenced to policy B2), rather than referring to only valued landscapes at C5(b)(iv). Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (and cross-reference made to policy B3). We understand that the Kent Downs National Landscape unit is currently updating its 2011 Renewable Energy Statement. Pending its publication your attention is drawn to the position statement of the High Weald National Landscape unit (2025). Namely that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. Ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. Solar farms (and other energy schemes) should not be approved unless there is evidence that the grid has capacity to connect them. How does this policy relate to a corresponding decision-making policy in the draft NPPF? Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/16	In 2a. suggest substitute 'encouraged' with 'should'. Reinstate clause from Adopted Local Plan about schemes on agricultural land. Solar should be on rooftops. Areas of landscape sensitivity/biodiversity should be protected.	The point about grid capacity is being discussed with evidence base consultants. The point about protection of agricultural land is covered in point 7 and policy B6. Further reference to designated landscapes and areas of ecological sensitivity will be added to 1b. Partial Change Agreed.
2026Reg18/31	CPRE campaigns for rooftop renewables but are concerned about loss of countryside to solar farms due to loss of agricultural land and impact on landscape. Plan provides no steering of siting of such development away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas. Specific reference should be made to National Landscape and guidance for High Weald - ie that ground mounted solar will not be acceptable. Evidence of grid capacity should be included in policy. How does this policy relate to a corresponding decision-making policy in the draft NPPF? Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?	Noted. Agree. Recognition of designated landscape and ecologically sensitive sites will be added to 1b. Agree. Reference will be added to National Landscape and guidance. Agree. Wording is being discussed with consultant. Policies will be reviewed once draft NPPF is updated. Yes, where possible. Have a strong policy with clear criteria will assist this going forward. Partial Change Agreed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	74	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the overall direction and ambition of the preamble to Policy C5. The justification for renewable energy development is clearly linked to the Climate Change Act 2008, national net zero targets and the Council's 2045 carbon neutral commitment, which is welcomed. To make the preamble more focussed, relatable and complete, the following points are suggested: 1. Clearer Local Context Whilst the national policy background is comprehensive, the preamble would benefit from: More explicit reference to local grid capacity constraints in Swale and on the Isle of Sheppey; Recognition of the increasing number of renewable and battery storage proposals coming forward in rural parishes; A clearer explanation of how renewable infrastructure will be spatially distributed across the borough. This would help communities better understand how national ambitions translate into local impacts. 2. Community Impacts and Co-Benefits Paragraph 30.0.6 refers to mitigating adverse impacts, which is supported. The preamble could be strengthened by: Explicit reference to landscape sensitivity, particularly in coastal and open countryside locations; Recognition of cumulative visual and traffic impacts;		
2026Reg18/76	56	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG have seen that this policy area is weak with the impact of Pitstock Solar Farm being passed without consideration of the Grid Connection and the timely manner of making that connection. When permission was granted the grid connection date was in 2035, some 11 years in the future, but this evidence was not supplied by the Applicant or requested by Swale. The impact of the grid connection should be considered with the planning application and sufficiently documented in the Environmental Impact Assessment, as one cannot exist without the other. It is "irrational" to take into account the benefits of a renewable energy development while ignoring the environmental impacts of the grid infrastructure needed to deliver those benefits.		
2026Reg18/82	13	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?					SARAH	MOAKES	The plan provides no guidelines as to the siting of such infrastructure contrary to draft NPPF policy W2 which requires it to identify 'areas which are suitable for renewable and low carbon energy development.' The Council's policy is worryingly non specific. It should as a minimum besteeering this type of development away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas such as designated landscapes or habitats sites. In particular, consideration n should be given to the fact that BESS are a known potential fire risk.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Agrees with overall direction and justification of preamble/policy but suggests improvements. Clearer local context eg grid capacity constraints, rural impact, spatial distribution. Community impacts and co-benefits - strengthen reference to landscape sensitivity (coastal/open locations), cumulative visual and transport impacts, meaningful community benefits, reference to BNG and habitat enhancements. Battery storage and safety (acknowledgement of risks, and emergency planning considerations, proximity to residential development, need to consult emergency services. Agricultural land and rural character (encourage use of lower grade agricultural land, support dual-use, protect BMV). Grid infrastructure and visual impact (acknowledge associated infrastructure (substations, pylons/overhead lines, reinforcement works and that they must be sensitively designed. Welcomes reference to heat networks - asks for clarity as to where they are most likely (urban over rural). Make stronger link to energy security (role of renewable energy in improving resilience, especially if community-owned.	Noted - Noted - Preamble will be updated with reference to renewable energy generation in Swale and grid capacity issues. Noted - Preamble will be updated with additional reference to designated landscapes/ecologically sensitive sites Noted - Preamble will be updated with reference to battery storage and safety. Noted - Policy/preamble will be updated with reference to Agricultural land and policy B6. Noted - Preamble will be updated with reference to associated infrastructure. Noted - Preamble will be updated with further reference to heat networks. Role of energy security is set out in 30.0.11. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/76	Impact of grid connection needs to be included in policy/preamble.	Agreed. Wording on grid capacity is being discussed with consultant who prepared evidence base. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/82	Plan provides no guidelines on siting of renewable infrastructure, contrary to draft NPPF (W2). Policy should be steering renewable energy development away from environmentally and ecologically sensitive area (landscape/habitat sites). Consideration should be given to BESS and fire risk.	The Regulation 18 has been prepared under the existing NPPF where there is no strict requirement to identify areas for renewable development. This is a significant piece of work that has been undertaken for Swale in previous years. Agree - additional wording on designated landscapes and ecologically sensitive sites will be added to policy C4/preamble. Agree - additional wording on battery fire risk will be added to policy C4/preamble. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/91	13	Question 057 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Southern Housing	Charles	Glover-Short	Please see our responses to questions 51, 52, 55 and 56 relating to the Climate, Energy and Waste Statement. The guidance referred to in relation to draft policies C3 and C4 does not appear to be referenced in the supporting text for Policy C5. It is important that clear guidance is provided to ensure that the statement is appropriate for meeting its aims, provide certainty and avoid duplication between the other necessary reports required to support a planning application. It is also not clear whether the requirements of Policy C5 apply to renewable energy developments only or to mixed use developments comprising a significant element of renewable energy. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.58		
2026Reg18/31	14	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent		Neither	CPRE campaigns for rooftop renewables and has been one of the driving forces behind the government announcing plans for all new-build homes to be fitted with solar panels from 2027 under the Future Homes Standard. However, we remain concerned about the loss of countryside (including generational loss of best and most versatile agricultural land) in relation to ground-mounted solar farms, as well as the impact this has on the landscape. The plan provides no guidelines as to the siting of such development, which should as a minimum be steered away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas. Specific reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (cross-referenced to policy B2), rather than referring to only valued landscapes at C5(b)(iv). Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (and cross-reference made to policy B3). We understand that the Kent Downs National Landscape unit is currently updating its 2011 Renewable Energy Statement. Pending its publication your attention is drawn to the position statement of the High Weald National Landscape unit (2025). Namely that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. Ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. Solar farms (and other energy schemes) should not be approved unless there is evidence that the grid has capacity to connect them. How does this policy relate to a corresponding decision-making policy in the draft NPPF? Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?
2026Reg18/32	8	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Historic England	Alan	Byrne		Neither	Note the section's/policy's references to the historic environment and heritage assets, but new large scale renewable energy generation has potential for impacts on historic landscape character and the setting of heritage assets; policy should make specific reference to the requirement for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment where appropriate

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/91	Planning Guidance referenced in other climate polices not mentioned in preamble to C5. Guidance is needed. Not clear if C5 applies to renewable energy or mixed used developments.	Agreed. Reference to Planning Guidance will be added to preamble. C5 works in conjunction with other policies across the plan, in particular C2 and C3 - as explained in 30.0.12. Partial Change Agreed.
2026Reg18/31	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: CPRE campaigns for rooftop renewables but are concerned about loss of countryside to solar farms due to loss of agricultural land and impact on landscape. Plan provides no steering of siting of such development away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas. Specific reference should be made to National Landscape and guidance for High Weald - ie that ground mounted solar will not be acceptable. Evidence of grid capacity should be included in policy. How does this policy relate to a corresponding decision-making policy in the draft NPPF? Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?	The Council comments as follows: Noted. Agree. Recognition of designated landscape and ecologically sensitive sites will be added to 1b. Agree. Reference will be added to National Landscape and guidance. Wording is being discussed with consultant. Policies will be reviewed once draft NPPF is updated. Yes, where possible. Have a strong policy with clear criteria will assist this going forward. Partial Change Agreed.
2026Reg18/32	Neither supports nor objects to this policy but requests amendments: Requests policy makes specific reference to requirement for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Reference to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment will be added to C5, point 1. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/76	57	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Opposition Group				Neither	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). Amendment required. Proposals for solar photovoltaic (PV) development will be supported where they are located on previously developed land, non-agricultural land, or lower-grade agricultural land (Grades 3b, 4 and 5). Development on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a). Swale should not allow PV development on BMV land. Most recently it has permitted so called temporary schemes of 40 years yet failed to secure full restoration of the land to its original quality at the end of the operational period. All applications for renewable or low-carbon energy developments must be accompanied by a comprehensive Grid Connection Strategy. This strategy shall: a) identify the proposed point(s) of connection to the electricity network; b) demonstrate that early engagement has taken place with the relevant network operator; c) outline the technical, environmental, and land requirements for the connection route; d) set out a realistic programme for securing and delivering the connection in line with the operational start date of the development.
2026Reg18/81	26	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Borden Parish Council				Neither	Whilst the local plan recognises the requirements to provide sufficient energy from renewable generation and storage, and has made progress in appreciating the value of enhancing biodiversity, providing space for nature and public open space, it avoids the critical questions of increasing sustainable local resilient and affordable food supply for the growing population. The principle resource for both renewable energy and food is land, so careful consideration must be given to location, land classification, aspect and balance The UK government prefers to reassure us that the food supply is resilient and can be readily provided or substituted by imports. In doing so it ignores the impacts of climate change on UK and overseas supplies, ignores the negative impacts on the UK balance of payments, inflation, rural employment, healthy nutrition and reducing yields, both domestic and international. The food industry is now calling for a change in this approach and a shift towards more UK production. Swale hosts much of the best and most versatile land in Kent, and the most favourable climate for high value horticultural crops. Unfortunately planning policy over many years has permitted the erosion of this area by readily permitting development on the grade 1 soils adjacent to the A2, and the proximate grade 11 and 11a soils principally to the South. In this context we believe that it has become prudent to revisit the current division of land between development, food production and renewable energy. It is our view that the first choice for solar farms and housing should be on those areas of grade 11 land of no wildfowl or habitat value, and wind turbines should be sensitively located on industrial sites, again where there is no negative impact on wildlife or habitat. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.57

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/76	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Proposals for PV development will be supported on previously developed land, non-agricultural land or low grade agricultural land, but not on BMV land. The Council has permitted temporary schemes yet failed to secure restoration conditions. All applications for renewable energy must be accompanied by a Grid Connection Strategy which shall: identify the proposed point(s) of connection to the electricity network;b) demonstrate that early engagement has taken place with the relevant network operator;c) outline the technical, environmental, and land requirements for the connection route;d) set out a realistic programme for securing and delivering the connection in line with the operational start date of the development.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted - Policy B6 deals with agricultural land and the Local Plan must be read as a whole. Noted - see Point 4d of policy. Agreed - policy will be reviewed with consultant to amend references to grid capacity. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/81	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Local Plan avoids critical question of sustainable food supply and land as a finite resource. UK Government assures food supply is resilient, but food industry calling for shift to more UK production. Swale hosts some of country's BMV land, and this resource has been eroded by planning policy. Solar farms and housing should be directed to grade 3 land with no wildlife or habitat value, with windfarms of industrial sites.	The Council (partially) agrees, for the following reasons: The issue of agricultural land is dealt with in policy B6, which prioritises lower grades of land over higher grades and only where there is an overriding need. Reference to that policy will be added to C5/its preamble as will reference to the Government's Land Use Framework and loss of agriculturally productive land. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/82	14	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?					SARAH	MOAKES		Neither	The plan provides no guidelines as to the siting of such infrastructurecontrary to draft NPPFpolicy W2 which requires it to identify 'areas which are suitable for renewable and low carbonenergy d evelopment.' The Council's policy is worryingly non specific. It should as a minimum besteeering this type of development away from environmentally or ecologically sensitive areas such asdesignated landscapes or habitats sites. In particular, consideration n should be given to the fact that BESS are a known potential fire risk.
2026Reg18/91	14	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Housing	Charles	Glover-Short		Neither	Please see our responses to questions 51, 52, 55 and 56 relating to the Climate, Energy and Waste Statement. The guidance referred to in relation to draft policies C3 and C4 does not appear to be referenced in the supporting text for Policy C5. It is important that clear guidance is provided to ensure that the statement is appropriate for meeting its aims, provide certainty and avoid duplication between the other necessary reports required to support a planning application. It is also not clear whether the requirements of Policy C5 apply to renewable energy developments only or to mixed use developments comprising a significant element of renewable energy. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.57
2026Reg18/107	6	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?		Rachel	Harrison	Peel Land & Property and Peel Ports (C/O Agent)					(See attached document) Policy C5 - Renewable Energy Development and Infrastructure 2.16.Policy C5 outlines the requirements for renewable energy development. The PoSL endorses the broad support for the development of renewable energy infrastructure within the Local Plan area.2.17.Part 1a of the policy refers to proposals being 'appropriate for its location'; this is relatively ambiguous and as such the language should be tightened or part 'a' removed, as part 'b' goes on to consider an analysis of impacts.2.18.Part 4a of Policy C5 notes: "Proposals for renewable energy generation over 20MW are required to provide an option to offer 5% community ownership to the local community (e.g. Parish Council area)". It is not clear how this would be sought or managed, and indeed if local communities such as Parish Councils have the interest, capacity or knowledge to take on such a position. This text should be amended to ensure flexibility; for example, by adding "When appropriate" to the beginning, or changing "required" to "encouraged".
2026Reg18/124	19	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent					See attached document 5.16.1In response to Questions 57 and 58 of the Consultation document Fernham Homes generally support the aspirations of Policy C5 in terms of setting out Policy specific to renewable energy development and infrastructure.5.16.2We however comment that the Policy wording for Criterion (9c) is not currently clear on the location of growth and regeneration areas. As a result of the associated impacts on developments of more than 50no. homes, Fernham Homes would reserve the right to provide further comments on any future iterations of the Policy once the growth and regeneration areas are confirmed. In the interests of completeness, it is recommended that SBC demonstrate these growth and regeneration areas on a subsequent Policy proposals map.5.16.3With this in mind, it is highlighted that the consultation NPPF does not set out guidance on the creation of new heat networks for residential developments.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/82	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Plan provides no guidelines on siting of renewable infrastructure, contrary to draft NPPF (W2). Policy should be steering renewable energy development away from environmentally and ecologically sensitive area (landscape/habitat sites). Consideration should be given to BESS and fire risk.	The Council (partially agrees), as follows: The Regulation 18 has been prepared under the existing NPPF where there is no strict requirement to identify areas for renewable development. This is a significant piece of work that has been undertaken for Swale in previous years. Agree - additional wording on designated landscapes and ecologically sensitive sites will be added to policy C4/preamble. Agree - additional wording on battery fire risk will be added to policy C4/preamble. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/91	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: The preamble to C5 does not reference the Climate, Energy and Waste Statement. Clear guidance is important. Not clear whether C5 applies to renewable energy developments or mixed use developments comprising renewable energy.	The Council comments as follows: Noted. Reference to the Climate, Energy and Waste Statement will be added to the preamble. Policy C5 applies to all renewable energy development and infrastructure, in conjunction with other policies in the plan, particularly C2 and C3, as explained in 30.0.12. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/107	Gives qualified support for this policy and seeks amendments: Broad support. Part 1a of the policy refers to proposals being 'appropriate for its location'; this is relatively ambiguous and as such the language should be tightened or part 'a' removed, as part 'b' goes on to consider an analysis of impacts. Part 4a of Policy C5 notes: "Proposals for renewable energy generation over 20MW are required to provide an option to offer 5% community ownership to the local community (e.g. Parish Council area)". It is not clear how this would be sought or managed, and indeed if local communities such as Parish Councils have the interest, capacity or knowledge to take on such a position. This text should be amended to ensure flexibility; for example, by adding "When appropriate" to the beginning, or changing "required" to "encouraged".	The Council (partially) disagrees, as follows: Noted. Point 1a and 1b will be linked in the next draft of the Local Plan, Regulation 19. This point will be discussed with consultants, but is considered a detailed point that can be resolved at the planning application stage. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/124	Gives qualified support for this policy, but seeks amendments: Criterion 9c is not clear on the location of 'growth and regeneration areas', which should be shown on a map. NPPF consultation does not set out guidance on the creation of heat networks for residential developments.	The Council (partially) agrees, for the following reasons: Agree, the clarity of 9c could be improved. Reference to 'growth and regeneration areas' will be amended to 'strategic sites'. Strategic sites will be shown in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. Noted. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	24	Question 058 Do you support or object to Policy C5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Policy C5 – Renewable Energy Development and Infrastructure Energy and AdaptationThe County Council considers that SBC could add greater and/or earlier emphasis on the energy security, affordability and resilience benefits of supporting renewables rollout, perhaps prior to discussion of net zero and emissions through this policy. It is also suggested that adding a reference to the Kent Design Guide - Kent County Council would be appropriate.
2026Reg18/73	18	Question 059 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the preamble and supports the strong emphasis on coastal change, given Swale's particular vulnerability as a coastal borough. The reference to the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance, Shoreline Management Plans and updated modelling is welcomed and appropriate. However, the following points would help make the preamble more focused, relatable and complete: 1. Clearer Local Context While the national policy framework is well set out, the preamble could be strengthened by: More explicit reference to the local impacts already being experienced in Swale (e.g. erosion at Warden and Leysdown, cliff instability, infrastructure pressure); A clearer explanation of what the updated CCMA boundary could mean for existing communities; Plain-English summaries of what inclusion within Erosion Zone 1 or 2 means for residents. This would make the policy more understandable to affected communities. 2. Greater Emphasis on Managed Retreat and Relocation The preamble refers to relocation but could: Expand on how relocation will realistically be facilitated; Clarify what support mechanisms may exist for affected landowners or communities; Explain how infrastructure (roads, utilities, services) will be managed where risk increases over time.		
2026Reg18/100	27	Question 059 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?					Minster on Sea	Parish Council	C6–C8 Flood/coast – Strong support Ask: Prioritise nature-based coastal solutions and ensure relocation/rollback tools are practical for vulnerable uses.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Neither support nor object to this policy, but suggest amendments: Increase emphasis on the energy security, affordability and resilience benefits of supporting renewables rollout It is also suggested that adding a reference to the Kent Design Guide - Kent County Council would be appropriate.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Energy security is already referenced in the preamble (30.0.11), but the preamble to C5 will be reviewed to ensure incorporation of all elements mentioned. Reference to Kent Design Guide will be added to the preamble. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/73	Seeks amendments to this pre-amble, as follows: Agrees with the preamble generally, but it could be strengthened. Include more explicit reference to local impacts eg erosion at Warden/Leysdown. Clearer explanation of what the updated CCMA boundary could mean for existing communities. Plain English summaries of what can be included in Erosion Zones 1 and 2. Expand on how relocation will be realistically facilitated. Clarify support mechanisms for those affected. Explain how infrastructure (roads, utilities, services) will be managed where risk increases. Explain impact on roads, utilities, PROW, community facilities. The need for co-ordinated planning between the Council, the EA, DEFRA, infrastructure providers. Confirmation of how applicants can identify whether their lands falls within the CCMA. Clarify expectations regarding scale and cost of Vulnerability Assessments - providing that they can be proportionate to the development scale. Acknowledge uncertainty of long-term climate modelling. Need for precautionary decision making where projections are severe. Recognise potential concern for affected communities. Confirm that engagement and communication will be ongoing as mapping becomes available.	The Council (partially agrees) for the following reasons: Noted. More explicit reference to local impacts will likely be included once the SFRA is completed. Clearer explanation of what the updated CCMA could mean for existing communities will likely be included in the preamble/policy once the SFRA is completed. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and wording on what can be included in Erosion Zones 1 and 2 may be revised. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of relocation will be considered in this review. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of support will be considered in this review. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of management of infrastructure will be considered in this review. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of impacts on infrastructure/community facilities will be considered in this review. The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of coordinating a response across councils/agencies will be considered in this review. The adopted Local Plan will contain a Proposals Map which will set out a clear boundary for the Coastal Change Management Area, which applicants will be able to reference. When the SFRA is published (anticipated summer 2026), a boundary will also be shown on that. The Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 74) Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK set out that vulnerability assessments should be 'appropriate to the degree of risk and the scale, nature and location of the development' and agreed in advance with the local planning authority. As such, they can be proportionate to the scale of development. Reference to para 74 of the PPG is already included in the preamble. The Council cannot advise on the cost of such an assessment. Paragraph 31.0.8 acknowledges that the 'definition of the erosion boundaries of the CCMA have been relatively high level in nature' and that if new evidence is presented it will be considered in consultation with the Environment Agency. Noted. Noted. It is anticipated that the SFRA (with details of the Coastal Change Management Area boundary) will be published ahead of the
2026Reg18/100	Supports the preamble, with comment: Asks to prioritise nature-based coastal solutions and ensure relocation/rollback tools are practical for vulnerable uses.	The pre-amble/policy will be reviewed in the light of the forthcoming SFRA, discussions with the consultant, the EA and other Council teams and the matter of relocation will be considered in this review. Partial Change Proposed (details of which will be set out once the SFRA is complete and discussions with the SFRA consultants, the Environment Agency and other Council teams have taken place).

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	56	Question 060 Do you support or object to Policy C6? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	The Parish Council supports the intention of Policy C6, particularly the restriction on permanent new residential development within the CCMA. However, there are serious and genuine concerns regarding the scale and speed of coastal erosion already being experienced. In some locations, erosion has already resulted in land being lost to the sea, and there are several other areas where further loss is anticipated within the coming years. This creates significant anxiety for residents and raises important questions about long-term safety, infrastructure and community sustainability. To strengthen the policy, the following amendments and additions are recommended: 1. Stronger Recognition of Current Coastal Loss The policy should explicitly acknowledge that: Coastal erosion is not a future-only risk it is already happening. Some sections of coastline have already been lost. Certain communities are at immediate and ongoing risk. This would make the policy more grounded in current reality rather than framed solely around projected modelling. 2. Clearer Position on Existing Residential Properties Whilst new permanent residential development is resisted, the policy should provide clearer guidance regarding: What support exists for existing homeowners in high-risk zones; Whether adaptation or protection measures are supported; How decisions will be made where properties approach the 20 year risk.
2026Reg18/127	21	Question 060 Do you support or object to Policy C6? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Support	2.7.3.2 Policy criteriaWe support the policy wording for C6 but advise that criterion 1 regarding the England Coast Path could be strengthened, as the legislation that underpins the England Coast Path (now known as King Charles III England Coast Path) also allows for rollback if erosion causes the loss of the current route. We therefore suggest the following wording:Page 13 of 35“1. It being demonstrated that the proposal will...d) not hinder the creation of the King Charles III England Coast Path. Where rollback has been identified, the proposal should seek to avoid these areas;”

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: There are serious and genuine concerns about the speed and scale of coastal erosion, which creates anxiety for the community and raises questions about long-term safety, infrastructure and community sustainability. The policy should explicitly set out existing and immediate/urgent risk - to make it more grounded in current reality. The policy should set out support for existing homeowners, views on adaptation and protection measures, decision making process for properties approaching the 20 year risk threshold. Residents need clarity and reassurance. The relocation elements of the policy need to be more practical and deliverable - setting out clear mechanisms, flexibility around sustainable locations outside built up area boundary, and confirmation that procedural barriers will not delay process. Policy should clarify 'planned lifetime'. The 50 year test for domestic extensions may be unrealistic in high-risk areas. More precautionary language may be needed in Erosion Zone 1. Needs stronger reference to: impacts on roads, utilities, PROW, emergency access; protection of critical infrastructure; coordinated planning with the EA and other authorities. Avoid unintended consequences by ensuring: development allowed in Erosion Zone 2 does not become permanent; holiday/caravan uses are genuinely temporary and safely managed; development does not increase erosion elsewhere.	
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support, for the following reasons: Include reference to rollback and suggests amended wording.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: To improve clarity/comprehensiveness, amend wording of C6 1d) to 'not hinder the creation of the King Charles III England Coast Path. Where rollback has been identified, the proposal should seek to avoid these areas;' Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	44	Question 061 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the overall intent of the preamble and supports the implementation of the Medway Estuary & Swale Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (MEAS). The preamble is comprehensive and clearly rooted in national policy and evidence. However, the following points would help make it more focused, relatable and complete: 1. Make the Local Impact More Immediate and Tangible The preamble is technically robust but would benefit from: Clearer reference to specific communities at risk (including low-lying coastal settlements); A stronger explanation of what flooding disruption would mean in practical terms (loss of homes, road closures, isolation of communities, pressure on emergency services); Explicit reference to the vulnerability of key infrastructure such as the A249 and access routes to the Isle of Sheppey. This would make the policy feel more grounded in lived reality rather than primarily strategic. 2. Clarify the Consequences of Funding Gaps Paragraphs 32.0.5–32.0.6 explain partnership funding well, but it would be helpful to state more directly: What happens if contributions are insufficient; Whether defence schemes could be delayed or scaled back; The potential implications for development already permitted.		
2026Reg18/74	23	Question 061 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	Preamble is excellent, but as in other places in the document the language is too weak in places. In para 32.0.14, for example, contributions towards the MEAS strategy should be REQUIRED, not just sought, from the parties listed.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Comments on the preamble, as follows: Agrees with overall intent, which is comprehensive, but suggests amendments. Included clearer reference to specific communities at risk, with stronger explanation of what flooding disruption would mean in practical terms and risk to specific infrastructure. Clarify consequences/risks of funding gaps - eg what happens if funding is insufficient, defences are delayed/scaled back, implications for existing/permited development. Explain rationale between contributions zones further. Strengthen reference to coastal squeeze and habitat compensation (delivery, obligations, managed realignment is evidence -led). Use subheadings to improve readability, with simple summaries. Emphasise need long-term strategic planning.	The Council responds, as follows: Noted - Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Partial Change Proposed (Preamble will be updated once evidence base is complete.)
2026Reg18/74	Gives qualified support for the preamble but suggests language is weak in places eg in 32.0.14 is should say 'be required', rather than 'should'.	Reference to 'should' in 32.0.14 can't be found but it is used in Policy C7. The Council agree this language could be strengthened and 'will' will replace 'should'. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	22	Question 061 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.7.4 C7 Implementing the Medway Estuary & Swale Coastal Risk Management Strategy 2.7.4.1 Preamble Natural England strongly supports the inclusion of this policy to implement the Medway Estuary & Swale (MEAS) Coastal Risk Management Strategy. We welcome the inclusion of 32.0.2 which details potential impacts to designated sites due to sea level rise and coastal squeeze. We advise that freshwater and terrestrial habitats behind seawalls are also at risk of being lost, and suggest the paragraph could state this using the following wording: "32.0.2 Furthermore, much of the Medway Estuary and Swale is covered by national and international designations that protect important species and habitats. As sea levels rise, some of this important habitat will be lost as it is 'squeezed' against the existing flood defences ('coastal squeeze'). Terrestrial and freshwater habitats behind seawalls that can no longer be sustainably protected in-situ will also be lost." We welcome paragraph 32.0.3 which provides information on the MEAS Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) strategy (2019). This is an evidence-based strategy that looks at short, medium and long-term future flooding and builds on the policies established in the Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs), as detailed in Policies B7 and C6 of the Draft Plan. We advise that it could be helpful to provide the following link to the national SMP website https://environment.data.gov.uk/shoreline-planning in paragraph 32.0.3. We also welcome paragraph 32.0.4 of the preamble which states that the MEAS strategy includes actions to create new intertidal and freshwater habitat. We advise that nationally and internationally designated sites are present behind seawalls, and impacts to these need to be addressed as the coast rolls back and unsuitable defences fail or are removed. We suggest the preamble could state this and suggest the following wording: "32.0.4 As well as reducing flood risk to over 14,000 properties, commercial and industrial sites, critical infrastructure, agricultural land and conservation sites in the implementation plan, the MEAS strategy also includes actions to create new intertidal and freshwater habitat to address the loss of designated habitats due to		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Supports this preamble for the following reasons: Supports preamble but suggests amendments to include reference to terrestrial and freshwater habitats. Suggest addition of link to SMP.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: To aid clarity NE's suggested amendment will be included in 32.0.2 as follows: "32.0.2 Furthermore, much of the Medway Estuary and Swale is covered by national and international designations that protect important species and habitats. As sea levels rise, some of this important habitat will be lost as it is 'squeezed' against the existing flood defences ('coastal squeeze'). Terrestrial and freshwater habitats behind seawalls that can no longer be sustainably protected in-situ will also be lost." To aid clarity NE's suggested amendment will be included in 32.0.3 as follows (link added): The Medway Estuary and Swale (MEAS) Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management(FCERM) strategy (2019) 157 is an evidence-based strategy that looked at future flooding over the short, medium and long-term and builds on the policies established in the Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) / https://environment.data.gov.uk/shoreline-planning Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	2	Question 062 Do you support or object to Policy C7? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurc h Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	The Parish Council supports Policy C7 in principle, recognising the critical importance of implementing the Medway Estuary & Swale Flood and Coastal Risk Management Strategy (MEAS) to protect homes, infrastructure, agricultural land and designated habitats. However, given the scale of flood and coastal risk facing the borough particularly low-lying coastal communities the following amendments and clarifications would strengthen the policy: 1. Greater Clarity on the Contributions Zone The policy refers to a “Contributions Zone” but does not define it within the policy wording itself. It would be helpful to: Clearly reference the spatial extent of the zone; Confirm how applicants will know whether they fall within higher or lower contribution areas; Ensure mapping is publicly accessible and easy to interpret. This would improve transparency and reduce uncertainty at application stage. 2. Stronger Wording on Securing Contributions The current wording states applicants “should” liaise and contribute. Given the strategic importance of MEAS, the Parish Council recommends replacing “should” with “must” where legally appropriate, to avoid ambiguity. For example: “Applicants must liaise...” “Applicants must contribute through planning obligations...” This would strengthen delivery and consistency.
2026Reg18/127	23	Question 062 Do you support or object to Policy C7? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.7.4.2 Policy criteriaWe support criteria 1 and 2 of Policy C7. However, we are currently unclear about the proposed requirement for applicants under criterion 3. It is our understanding that compensation requirements for sea level rise and coastal squeeze will have been covered strategically by the Environment Agency, provided that the development is located in a stretch of coastline managed as ‘hold the line’. Whilst developers may be required to identify and provide measures for other impacts to designated sites under the Habitats Regulations and Policy B1 of the Draft Plan, it is our understanding that applicants would not be required to provide additional compensatory habitats associated with sea level rise and coastal squeeze. We would like to know if developers will be asked to provide these additional compensatory habitats. We recognise that the detail of this is perhaps in the MEAS Contributions Advice Note 2026, which we have not seen, but we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the Council prior to the Regulation 19 consultation to understand the criteria for Policy C7 and provide advice on the policy wording.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified supports for this policy for the following reasons: Recognises importance of the Medway Estuary & Swale Flood and Coastal Risk Management Strategy. Seeks clarification on extent of Contributions Zone in policy wording and mapping is clear and accessible. Seeks stronger wording eg 'must' instead of 'should'. Seeks clarification in policy on whether development will be phased in line with delivery of flood defences and how risks are managed in mean time/safeguards if MEAS is delayed. Seeks clarification on who holds long-term responsibility/confirmation residents are not exposed to unmanageable liabilities/ensuring legal agreements secure maintenance for lifetime of development. Seeks clarification on how compensatory habitat will be secured and monitored/aligned with MEAS timescales/avoiding unintended consequences for existing rural land uses when habitat realignment occurs Seek stronger statements about MEAS primarily about protecting existing residents/safeguarding critical infrastructure/ensuring resilience for the future.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted. The Contributions Zone will be included in the Local Plan's Proposals Map so will be clearly defined. Paragraph 32.0.14 sets out the intended geographical scope of the zone. The SFRA, once complete, is also likely to include more detail on the geographical extent of the zone. As the MEAS Contributions Advice Note progresses, this may include more detail, if considered necessary. Agree in principle. 'Should' in Policy C7 will be amended to 'will'. The MEAS is an EA project and the programme will be prioritised based on flood defence asset condition and risk to properties - not location etc of proposed development. Contributions cannot be used to justify inappropriate development, and sites will still need to demonstrate they are safe for the lifetime of the development. Furthermore, contributions do not confer a requirement on the EA to carry out works. Flood defences in the UK are multi-faceted involving national and local authorities and individual property owners, the detail of which is too complex to set out in this policy which is about gathering contributions to the MEAS. Compensatory habitat delivery will require planning permission and as such, this detail will be set out via the planning application process. The aspirations of MEAS are set out in paragraph 32.0.4. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/127	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Supports criteria 1 and 2, but unclear about criteria 3 as it is their understanding that compensation requirements for sea level rise and coastal squeeze will be covered strategically by the EA, provided that the development is located in a stretch of coastline managed as 'hold the line'.	The Council agree for the following reasons: Noted. Revised wording has been agreed with the Environment Agency as follows: 3. Identify, and satisfy where relevant, the legal requirement...' Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	20	Question 064 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the content of the preamble and supports the clear explanation of the range of consents and permits that may be required alongside planning permission. The section is helpful and necessary. To make it more focussed, relatable and complete, the following refinements are suggested: 1. Emphasise Early Engagement The preamble would benefit from stronger wording encouraging early pre-application engagement with: The Environment Agency Kent County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority and Highway Authority) The Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board Southern Water and South East Water Early dialogue can prevent delay, redesign and increased costs later in the planning process. This is particularly important in coastal and low-lying areas such as Swale and the Isle of Sheppey. 2. Clarify the Difference Between Planning Permission and Other Consents Many applicants and residents do not clearly understand that: Planning permission does not remove the need for separate flood risk, drainage or marine consents. The preamble could more explicitly state that: Planning permission and flood risk activity permits or land drainage consents are separate regulatory regimes, and approval under one does not imply approval under the other.		
2026Reg18/119	12	Question 064 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Marine Management Organisation	Sir/Madam	.	Further points to noteWe welcome the references to the Marine Policy Statement, Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and the South East Marine Plan.We recommend a couple of suggested amendments within these sections:• 33.0.28 which references the need for consents from the MMO, it might be useful to mention the extent being “mean high water springs” and it relates to other works besides just construction and dredging.		
2026Reg18/127	24	Question 064 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.7.5 C8 Flood riskPage 14 of 352.7.5.1 PreambleNatural England supports this policy. We advise that it would be helpful to provide more information on natural flood management in the policy preamble, for instance links to local partnerships. Further information could be provided on both natural flood management and nature-based solutions, for instance on how slowing flow upstream can provide freshwater habitat in locations away from saline intrusion and coastal development. Further advice on natural flood management and nature-based solutions can be found in the following links:•Natural flood management programme - GOV.UK•Nature-based solutions: Environment Agency position statement - GOV.UK		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Comments on the preamble as follows: Agrees with content, which is helpful. Suggest refinements. Encourage early pre-application engagement with EA/KCC (LLFA and HA), Drainage Board, Water companies. Explain that other consents, on top of planning permission, may be needed. Explain further why 100/75 year lifetime assumptions are needed/role of emergency planning and evacuation routes/flood resilience and resistance designed from outset. Strengthen section on Emergency Planning. Reinforce role of SuDs. Explain climate change allowance and lifetime assumptions.	The Council response as follows: Noted. This is already set out in 33.0.33. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Further detail will be included once evidence base is complete. Partial Change Proposed (Preamble will be updated once evidence base is complete.)
2026Reg18/119	Comments on the pre-ample as follows: Welcomes the references to the Marine Policy Statement, Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and the South East Marine Plan. Recommend in33.0.28 which references the need for consents from the MMO, it might be useful to mention the extent being "mean high water springs" and it relates to other works besides just construction and dredging.	The Council agrees: Noted. Agree. Underlined text to be added to 33.0.28: Marine Management Organisation- for works including construction and dredging in English inshore and offshore areas, including waters up to up to mean high water spring. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/127	Supports this preamble, and comments: Provide more information on natural flood management in the preamble eg links to local partnerships/ nature-based solutions/ slowing the flow/ providing freshwater habitat and includes links.	Noted. Preamble will be adjusted to include reference to natural flood management in the preamble eg links to local partnerships/ nature-based solutions/ slowing the flow/ providing freshwater habitat and will include appropriate links from Gov.Uk (Natural Flood Management and Nature Based Solutions (EA Position Statement)). Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/40	67	Question 065 Do you support or object to Policy C8? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC support Policy C8. Due to climate change this will be a growing future risk and an extremely important risk to be managed, whilst safeguarding and retaining our important coastal environment. An additional policy aim could be added to mitigate flooding risks on the Kent Downs dip slope by restoration of hedgerows and woodland planting.
2026Reg18/120	17	Question 065 Do you support or object to Policy C8? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	L	Sinden (DHA)	Persimmon Homes				Object	4.13.1 Persimmon generally supports the inclusion of Policy C8 which broadly reflects the requirements for managing development within flood risk areas as set out in national guidance. However, the Policy needs reviewing to ensure it is justified and effective. 4.13.2 In the interests of ensuring consistency with national policy Criteria (2) should be amended as follows: "Avoid inappropriate development in accordance with the NPPF and PPG in areas at risk of flooding. Where development is necessary in areas of flood risk, the development must be made safe for its lifetime, not increase flood risk elsewhere and seek opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding". 4.13.3 Criterion (3) sets out how the Sequential Test and Exception Test will be applied (when required), which is to be guided by SBC's 'The Application of the Sequential & Exception Tests for Planning Applications in Swale'. In this regard, we would recommend that national guidance (and the consultation NPPF) should take precedence over SBC's guidance document in the interests of providing a justified and consistent Policy that can be applied effectively. 4.13.4 With this in mind, we would recommend that the Policy should be amended to relate to the most up-to-date Environment Agency (EA) flood mapping, as this sees more regular updates and would seek to relieve pressure on SBC to ensure the Borough's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment remains consistently up-to-date throughout the Plan period. This in turn would allow for future flexibility with up-to-date evidence rather than utilising a document that will become outdated.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/40	Support this policy for the following reasons: Due to climate change this will be a growing future risk and is an important risk to be managed. An additional policy aim could be added to mitigate flooding risks on the Kent Downs dip slope by restoration of hedgerows and woodland planting.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Noted. An extra reference to Natural Flood Management will be added to preamble. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/120	Objects to policy for the following reasons: Seek inclusion of reference to NPPF and PPG in Criteria 2. National guidance should take precedence over local guidance (on the Sequential Test) referred to in Criteria 3. Policy should be amended to relate to up to date EA mapping, over SFRA.	The Council partially agrees for the following reasons: Agree that reference to the NPPF and PPG should be included in Point 2. The PPG sets out that 'for individual planning applications subject to the sequential test, the area to which the test needs to be applied will be governed by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed and the needs it is proposing to address.' As such it is appropriate for local guidance to be used and referred to in point 3. Agree, reference to EA mapping will be added to Policy C8. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/124	21	Question 065 Do you support or object to Policy C8? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent				Object	(See attached documents) 5.18.1Fernham Homes generally supports the inclusion of Policy C8 which broadly reflects the requirements for managing development within flood risk areas as set out in national guidance. In response to Questions 64 and 65 of the Consultation document we however comment that the Policy needs reviewing to ensure it is justified and effective. 5.18.2In the interests of ensuring consistency with national policy Criteria (2) should be amended as follows:“Avoid inappropriate development in accordance with the NPPF and PPG in areas at risk of flooding. Where development is necessary in areas of flood risk, the development must be made safe for its lifetime, not increase flood risk elsewhere and seek opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding”. 5.18.3Criterion (3) sets out how the Sequential Test and Exception Test will be applied (when required), this sets out how this will be guided by SBC’s ‘The Application of the Sequential & Exception Tests for Planning Applications in Swale’. In this regard, we would recommend that national guidance (and the consultation NPPF) should take precedence over SBC’s guidance document in the interests of providing a justified and consistent Policy that can be applied effectively. 5.18.4With this in mind, we would recommend that the Policy should be amended to relate to the most up-to-date Environment Agency (EA) flood mapping, as this sees more regular updates and would seek to relieve pressure on SBC to ensure the Borough’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment remains consistently up-to-date throughout the Plan period. This in turn would allow for future flexibility with up-to-date evidence rather than utilising a document that will become outdated.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/124	Objects to policy for the following reasons: Seek inclusion of reference to NPPF and PPG in Criteria 2. National guidance should take precedence over local guidance (on the Sequential Test) referred to in Criteria 3. Policy should be amended to relate to up to date EA mapping, over SFRA.	The Council partially agrees for the following reasons: Agree that reference to the NPPF and PPG should be included in Point 2. The PPG sets out that 'for individual planning applications subject to the sequential test, the area to which the test needs to be applied will be governed by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed and the needs it is proposing to address.' As such it is appropriate for local guidance to be used and referred to in point 3. Agree, reference to EA mapping will be added to Policy C8. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	25	Question 065 Do you support or object to Policy C8? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Policy C8 – Flood Risk Flood and Water ManagementThe County Council, whilst generally content with the policy, considers that it could go further whereby SBC requires for sites proposed within catchments that are known to contribute to existing flood issues within the district (e.g. upstream of Swanley), they can only discharge at rate equivalent to or below Qbar, and that a staged discharge will not be acceptable. Qbar technically is the peak rate of flow from a catchment for the mean annual flood (a return period of approximately 1 in 2.3 years), whilst this would obviously not provide betterment for those events below the 1 in 2.3 year for all rainfall events of a 'size' larger than that the betterment would be significant and it would be these that are associated with the majority of risk. The LLFA would be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss should SBC so wish. The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy should also be taken into account.In June 2025 DEFRA released its national standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) which will supersede some of the guidance within the current policy. The LLFA advises that whilst its Drainage and Planning Policy Statement is largely still relevant – see link above. Until updated, all applicants submitting drainage strategies should aim to reflect these latest national standards within their drainage strategies. Any existing local plan policies should also be referenced within submissions. Energy and AdaptationThe County Council supports this policy and is pleased to see the reference to climate change adaptation and other multifunctional benefits, as well as the prioritisation of natural flood management.
2026Reg18/127	25	Question 065 Do you support or object to Policy C8? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.7.5.2 Policy criteriaNatural England particularly supports criterion 1 which requires development proposals to prioritise and seek opportunities to provide natural flood management and multifunctional benefits, linking with strategies for BNG, and green and blue infrastructure and climate change mitigation and adaptation. We advise that criteria 1 could be strengthened with the following wording:"1. Prioritise and seek opportunities to provide natural flood management and multifunctional benefits linking flood risk management to nature-based solutions and strategies for green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and ecological connectivity, improved health and wellbeing and mitigation and adaptation to climate change".
2026Reg18/19	1	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Lower Medway Int. Drainage Board			The Board is content that Policy C9 appropriately addresses sustainable drainage in planning terms. If helpful, the Council may wish to consider a brief signpost in the supporting text to the need for separate IDB consenting where development affects ordinary watercourses, to aid clarity for applicants.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Generally content, but could go further with regards discharge rates. Local Risk Management Strategy should also be taken into account. National standards for sustainable drainage have been released and should be reflected in policy and applications. Supports point 1.	The Council agrees: Noted. Noted and agreed. Noted and agreed. Noted. KCC's comments will be reviewed alongside their comments to Policy C9 and changes made where relevant. Partial Change Agreed.
2026Reg18/127	Supports this policy for the following reasons: Particularly supports Criterion 1, but could be strengthened as follows: 'Prioritise and seek opportunities to provide natural flood management and multifunctional benefits linking flood risk management to nature-based solutions and strategies for green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and ecological connectivity, improved health and wellbeing and mitigation and adaptation to climate change'.	Agreed Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/19	Support preamble and policy but suggest signpost to separate IDB consenting for ordinary watercourses, to aid clarity for developers.	Noted and agreed in principle The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/131	9	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Environment Agency		.	Policy C9 - Sustainable Drainage We support the reference to the Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK to assist in the design, maintenance and operation of sustainable drainage systems within paragraph 34.0.6. Paragraph 34.0.15 specifically mentions what the Environment Agency would support and what advice we would issue. We are in agreement with these points. However, Policy C9 does not mention that there should be no discharge into land impacted by contamination, land previously identified as being contaminated or made ground. This is supported by position C4, G10, G11, G12 and G13 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Furthermore, for those areas where infiltration SuDS are proposed for anything other than clean roof drainage in a source protection zone 1, a hydrogeological risk assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the system does not pose an unacceptable risk to the source of supply, this is supported by position G13 and in conjunction with G10 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Policy C10 – Water quality and water resourcesWe support the specific consideration for the protection of groundwater and source protection zones. We'd ask there to be further reference to the Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. This serves as a basis on how to approach and protect groundwater. There is no mention within the policy that developers should follow the drainage hierarchy when considering the disposal of foul drainage. Government guidance contained within the national Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality – considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order:• Connection to the public sewer• Package sewage treatment plant (adopted in due course by the sewerage company or owned and operated under a new appointment or variation)• Septic Tank Foul drainage should be connected to the main sewer. Where this is not		
2026Reg18/11	6	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?					jennifer	anderson	Rainwater run-off in new developments should not be allowed to discharge into existing highway drains or sewerage drains until it can be demonstrated by the developer that there is sufficient capacity.		
2026Reg18/16	20	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	§ 2f Instead of the somewhat vague-sounding 'enable sustainable maintenance', suggest something along the lines of draft NPPF policy F8 para 2b 'have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the anticipated lifetime of the development.' § 1g Consider replacing 'relevant Planning Guidance produced by the Council' with 'local and national guidance'.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/131	Support references to EA statements and advice as set out in paragraphs 34.0.6 and 34.0.15. Policy C9 should mention 'no discharge into land impacted by contamination, land previously identified as being contaminated or made ground' which is supported in C4, G10, G11, G12 and G13 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Furthermore, policy C9 should mention that for those areas where infiltration SuDS are proposed for anything other than clean roof drainage in a source protection zone 1, a hydrogeological risk assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the system does not pose an unacceptable risk to the source of supply, this is supported by position G13 and in conjunction with G10 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Support mention of SuDs as a benefit to water quality. Support mention of drainage hierarchy, but in part 2a, the drainage hierarchy should be set out, along with specific references to the parts of the 'Kent County Council Drainage and Planning Policy: A Local Flood Risk Management Strategy' the policy is referring to. We support that the policy (34.0.1) is linked with Policy C10 Water Quality and Water Resources and that the policy is looking at the benefits to water quality as well as flood risk.	Noted. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/11	Rainwater run-off in new developments should not be allowed to discharge into existing highway drains or sewerage drains until it can be demonstrated by the developer that there is sufficient capacity.	Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/16	Suggests amending vague-sounding 'enable sustainable maintenance', with something along the lines of draft NPPF policy F8 para 2b 'have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the anticipated lifetime of the development.' Consider replacing 'relevant Planning Guidance produced by the Council' with 'local and national guidance'.	The criteria listed in point 2 of policy C9 are a repeat of policies in a KCC document - it is not within the Council's gift to amend that document, but this reference will be reviewed. Item F1 - Appendix 2 Drainage-and-Planning-policy-statement 2019.pdf Policies need to be as specific as possible as to what is required and the phrase 'local and national guidance' might be open to interpretation. An amendment to be consistent with C8 which references compliance with NPPF, PPG, EA and CIRIA guidance, will be discussed with the LLFA. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	41	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council supports the overall direction of the preamble to Policy C9, particularly the strong alignment with the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Kent County Council's Drainage and Planning Policy. The emphasis on multifunctional benefits, early design integration and long-term maintenance is welcomed. To make the preamble more focussed, relatable and locally grounded, the following refinements are suggested. 1. Stronger Local Context – Isle of Sheppey and Low-Lying Areas Whilst the national and policy context is well referenced, the preamble would benefit from clearer reference to: The particular vulnerability of low-level marshland and coastal areas; The increasing frequency of intense rainfall events; Surface water flooding as one of the most common forms of flooding in Swale (as identified in the SFRA); The cumulative drainage pressures on the Isle of Sheppey. Including a short paragraph highlighting the Island's drainage constraints, reliance on pumping infrastructure and flat topography would make the policy more locally relatable and evidence-based. 2. Clearer Emphasis on Maintenance and Long-Term Management The preamble rightly references maintenance arrangements, but this could be made more explicit by: Stating clearly that SuDS must have secured, funded, and enforceable long-term maintenance arrangements;		
2026Reg18/74	27	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	Yes. The preamble should take into consideration that, in Swale, "ordinary watercourses" are likely to be chalk streams flowing from the chalk aquifer of the North Downs and therefore a very high national priority for protection. Polluted surface water from roads and CSOs should not be channelled into chalk streams like the Westbrook and Cooksditch in Faversham, and where it is that should be rectified.		
2026Reg18/76	65	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). The preamble provides a very good insight into the complexity and volume of plans and bodies involved in sustainable drainage management. The policy should include a reference to C10 and protection of Water quality and Water Resources, as inappropriate SuDs in a Groundwater Protection Zone could have significant impacts on water quality and the water scarcity that has to be managed.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Supports direction of preamble Suggests stronger local context (vulnerability of low lying/coastal areas, increased intensity of rainfall events, surface water flooding is the most common form of flooding, cumulative drainage pressures) Clearer emphasis on maintenance and long-term management (secured/funded/enforceable long-term maintenance arrangements, clarity on adoption (KCC/ management company/other, recognising that poorly maintained SuDs can increase flood risk rather than reduce it. Cumulative impact and capacity - reference need to consider cumulative surface water impacts across catchments/interaction between new development and existing networks and groundwater/importance of not placing additional pressure on already constrained systems - particularly in marsh/groundwater-sensitive systems. Welcome references to groundwater vulnerability zones but asks for more emphasis on high groundwater level risk in winter/re-inforce that infiltration may not be appropriate in some areas/importance of seasonal groundwater monitoring. To make the preamble more accessible add summary paragraph on why SUDS are important to Swale/ provide explanation of drainage hierarchy in plain language/add statement about climate change brining increase short-duration, high intensity rainfall events. Make stronger link to climate change and adaptation (climate resilience/role in urban cooling, key adaptation measure)	Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/74	The preamble should note that ordinary watercourses in Swale are likely to be chalk streams and therefore a national priority for protection. Pollution from surface water runoff and combined sewage outfalls should not be channelled into chalk streams and where it is, the matter should be rectified.	Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/76	Supports the preamble. Policy should include reference to Policy C10 on Water Quality & Water Resources as inappropriate SuDs in a Groundwater Protection Zone can have significant impacts on water quality/scarcity that has to be managed.	Noted. Noted. The Plan should be read as a whole, and internal referencing is not a requisite, however, this point will be considered in light of the general review of the policy and preamble. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/81	27	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Borden Parish Council			There are serious concerns regarding the capacity and maintenance of existing drainage and sewer infrastructure serving the parish. There is evidence of systems operating at or beyond capacity, with incidents of overflow that appear to be linked to inadequate maintenance and insufficient network provision. Further development without confirmed and funded upgrades to drainage infrastructure will exacerbate flood risk, environmental harm, and potential public health issues. The Local Plan must require that: A full assessment of existing sewer and surface water capacity is undertaken prior to allocation or approval of development; Necessary upgrades are secured, funded, and delivered in advance of or alongside occupation of new dwellings; Ongoing maintenance responsibilities are clearly defined and enforced; and Development does not proceed where there is insufficient confirmed capacity within the drainage network. Drainage infrastructure must be treated as a fundamental element of infrastructure-led development, not as an issue to be addressed retrospectively. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.67		
2026Reg18/126	1	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning	Flood & Water Management The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), notes that it is proposed for the Swale Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be updated prior to the Regulation 19 submission. Swale Borough Council (SBC) should satisfy itself that the proposed updated SFRA utilises the latest surface flood maps released by the Environment Agency (EA) last year in order to comply with paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The County Council would suggest that SBC may wish to include advice as detailed in National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - GOV.UK in regard to drainage hierarchy. This makes it clear that it is not acceptable to disregard, in permeable geologies, the use of infiltration due to the layout proposed conflicting with the required exclusion zones associated with infiltrating features; the County Council will expect the site layout to be altered in order to comply with the hierarchy. Answer below duplicated at question 66/67 Policy C9 – Sustainable Drainage Flood and Water Management Para 33.0.30 - The County Council would ask that this statement is made clearer in that the LMIDB only has jurisdiction for part of Swale, with the County Council's land drainage (consenting) authority for those areas outside the LMIDB area of jurisdiction. It is understood that this is explained elsewhere but it is felt that this sentence could be left to interpretation and it is therefore suggested that this is changed. Paragraph 34.0.9 - The County Council would advise that advice given under Policy C8 regarding DEFRA's new standards applies to all forms of development and so should also be considered alongside the requirements of the NPPF for all development proposals. Paragraph 34.0.12 - The County Council would advise that the comments made on DEFRA's new standards above applies to all forms of development and so should also be considered alongside the requirements of the NPPF for all development proposals. Paragraph 34.0.13 - The County Council would advise that DEFRA's new standards require all		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/81	Serious concerns about capacity and maintenance of the existing drainage and sewer infrastructure serving Borden parish, with systems operating at or beyond capacity and incidents of overflow that appear to be linked to inadequate maintenance and insufficient network provision. Further development, without upgrades, could exacerbate flood risk, environmental hard and public health. Drainage infrastructure must be treated as a fundamental element of infrastructure-led development, not to be addressed retrospectively. The Local Plan must require a full assessment of existing sewer and surface water capacity prior to allocation or approval of development/that upgrades are secured, funding and delivered in advance or alongside occupation of dwellings/ongoing maintenance is defined and enforced/development does not proceed where there is insufficient capacity in the network.	Noted. Noted. As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, Swale Borough Council undertakes a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and works with the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC), the Environment Agency and Southern Water on this. This looks at all sources of flooding across the borough. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/126	Notes the SFRA is to be updated and urges Council to satisfy itself that the latest surface water maps released by the EA in 2025 have been used - in order to comply with paragraph 172 of the NPPF. Suggest SBC include advice on National Standards for Sustainable Drainage in regard to the drainage hierarchy. This makes it clear that it is not acceptable to disregard, in permeable geologies, the use of infiltration due to the layout proposed conflicting with the required exclusion zones associated with infiltrating features; the County Council will expect the site layout to be altered in order to comply with the hierarchy. Clarify 33.0.30 with reference to LMIDB only having jurisdiction for part of Swale with the County Council having jurisdiction for other areas. Advise that reference to DEFRA's new standards applies to all forms of development and should be considered alongside the requirements of the NPPF for all development proposals (ref paragraphs 34.0.9 and 34.0.12) In paragraph 34.0.13 advise that DEFRA's new standards require all proposals to demonstrate interception of the first 5mm of any surface water rainfall on site as close to source as possible. Furthermore, the latest standards place emphasis on the pepper potting of SuDS features throughout any development proposals and that the use of pipe to large basin designs is no longer acceptable. The County Council ask this to be mentioned. Comments references Policy C9 directly (rather than preamble) and seeks reference (further to the climate change requirements of the Environment Agency (EA),) to the DEFRA standards which set limitations in relation to rates of runoff inclusive of climate change adjustments (see standard 3 - National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - GOV.UK) with a 'inclusive of any required climate change allowances as set by the EA' statement.) Supports references to multi-functional benefits.	Noted. SBC can confirm that the latest Surface Water mapping has been used. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	26	Question 066 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.7.6 C9 Sustainable Drainage2.7.6.1 PreambleNatural England supports with policy and the multiple benefits from SuDS identified in paragraph 34.0.1. We also support natural solutions and source control solutions as mentioned in paragraph 34.0.13. We would like to signpost the CIRIA guidance for designing SuDS to treat and reduce phosphorous and nitrogen in surface water:•Using SuDS to reduce phosphorus in surface water runoff (C808F)•Using SuDS to reduce nitrogen in surface water runoff (C815F)These guidance documents were created specifically for nutrient neutrality designated catchment areas; however, the design principles they contain are equally relevant to catchments that do not fall under nutrient neutrality requirements.		
2026Reg18/131	10	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Environment Agency		.		Neither	Policy C9 - Sustainable Drainage We support the reference to the Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK to assist in the design, maintenance and operation of sustainable drainage systems within paragraph 34.0.6. Paragraph 34.0.15 specifically mentions what the Environment Agency would support and what advice we would issue. We are in agreement with these points. However, Policy C9 does not mention that there should be no discharge into land impacted by contamination, land previously identified as being contaminated or made ground. This is supported by position C4, G10, G11, G12 and G13 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Furthermore, for those areas where infiltration SuDS are proposed for anything other than clean roof drainage in a source protection zone 1, a hydrogeological risk assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the system does not pose an unacceptable risk to the source of supply, this is supported by position G13 and in conjunction with G10 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Policy C10 – Water quality and water resourcesWe support the specific consideration for the protection of groundwater and source protection zones. We'd ask there to be further reference to the Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. This serves as a basis on how to approach and protect groundwater. There is no mention within the policy that developers should follow the drainage hierarchy when considering the disposal of foul drainage. Government guidance contained within the national Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality – considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order:• Connection to the public sewer• Package sewage treatment plant (adopted in due course by the sewerage company or owned and operated under a new appointment or variation)• Septic Tank Foul drainage should be connected to the main sewer. Where this is not

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Natural England supports the policy and preamble but want to signpost several documents, and their updates, which have been created specifically for nutrient neutrality designated catchments, although the principles can be applied elsewhere: Using SuDS to reduce phosphorus in surface water runoff C808F New guidance for Using SuDS to reduce nitrogen in surface water runoff	Noted and agreed to add reference to documents signposted by NE. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/131	Partially agrees with the Policy (and preamble) for the following reasons: Support references to EA statements and advice as set out in paragraphs 34.0.6 and 34.0.15. Policy C9 should mention 'no discharge into land impacted by contamination, land previously identified as being contaminated or made ground' which is supported in C4, G10, G11, G12 and G13 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Furthermore, policy C9 should mention that for those areas where infiltration SuDS are proposed for anything other than clean roof drainage in a source protection zone 1, a hydrogeological risk assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the system does not pose an unacceptable risk to the source of supply, this is supported by position G13 and in conjunction with G10 of Environment Agency's Groundwater protection position statements - GOV.UK. Support mention of SuDs as a benefit to water quality. Support mention of drainage hierarchy, but in part 2a, the drainage hierarchy should be set out, along with specific references to the parts of the 'Kent County Council Drainage and Planning Policy: A Local Flood Risk Management Strategy' the policy is referring to. We support that the policy (34.0.1) is linked with Policy C10 Water Quality and Water Resources and that the policy is looking at the benefits to water quality as well as flood risk.	The Council agrees, as follows: Noted - Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted and agreed in principle. Noted - The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/40	60	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC strongly support the Policy C9. New "developments" provide an opportunity to guide existing landowners to improve drainage from beyond the site of the development itself that will reduce the risk of flooding. Could such an aim be added to the policy? Such as commitments to more hedgerow restoration, woodland planting and land management for nature. BPC are particularly concerned about unacceptable risks of pollution of groundwater sources. Section 3 of the policy regarding planning applications for development sites could be improved by making sign off by the responsible water authority mandatory. For example, sign off by Southern Water for confirmation of sewage processing capability. An example of an unacceptable risk to groundwater sources was highlighted in the Highsted Park Inquiry. Whilst reading through some of the supplementary evidence that section 2 signposts we noticed the following: In 1.1.3 it is noted that "Kent County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plan will continue to provide the policy framework for waste and minerals and all Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) will roll forward as they will relate to the parent policy in this plan once approved." The Kent County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policy CSW 6 item 2 states that "Planning permission will be granted for proposals that do not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts upon Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Ancient Woodland, Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)s and groundwater resources. (See Figures 7, 8, 10 & 15)". The Highsted Park application proposes the locating of a Built Waste Management Facilities where it will adversely impact Cromers Wood which, according to Kent Wildlife Trust, is "An ancient semi-natural woodland on the south-east side of a dry slope valley. Carpets of wood anemone are followed by bluebells, early purple and common spotted orchids." In addition, the policy point 5 states that "Planning permission will be granted for proposals that avoid

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/40	Supports this policy for the following reasons: New developments provide an opportunity for existing landowners to improve drainage from beyond development sites that will reduce the risk of development. Can this, and commitment to plant hedgerows, woodland planting, land management be added to the policy? Concerned about risks of pollution to groundwater. Can policy make sign off by responsible authority (eg Southern Water) mandatory? Cites example from the Highsted planning application for a Built Waste Management Facility (in SPZ1) which will be in contravention of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policy CSW 6.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Policies in the Local Plan guide decisions for future development. It is difficult for the Local Plan to influence development where no planning application is needed. Other policies in the plan promote the planting of woodland, trees and hedgerows. This will be considered in the redrafting of this policy and any amendments included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/53	5	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Water Services Ltd				Object	Southern Water is the wastewater service provider for the Swale district, supplying water to parts of the district. Southern Water strongly supports adherence to the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage issued by Government in June 2025 and request these be firmly embedded within this policy to ensure that it complies with the national policy presumption in favour of sustainable development. We welcome the requirement for Development to demonstrate that sustainable drainage has been considered at the earliest stages of scheme development, the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage (referred to below as 'National Standards') states under Principle 9 that Developers should also demonstrate compliance with the national standards from the conceptual stage of the application process, as per the excerpt below: Links with development planning Principle 9 Developers should demonstrate compliance with the national standards from the conceptual stage of the planning application process and that a 'SuDS Approach' has been integrated throughout the development and its landscape design. Principle 10 All appropriate planning applications should demonstrate how the national standards have been met in the site design. Principle 11 Where a development is phased, the design of the surface water drainage system should ensure that each of the standards will be delivered for each phase of the development. The proposals should consider the effects of each stage of site development, as well as the performance of the surface water drainage system. This is to ensure risks are mitigated and both short-term and long-term benefits are maximised. References to KCC sustainable drainage policy made in point 2 of the policy C9 require correction, as surface and rainwater harvesting for non-potable re-use is now at the top of the hierarchy of drainage routes in section 4.2 of the National

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/53	Southern Water supports adherence to National Standards for sustainable drainage, issued by the government in June 2025 and requests these are firmly embodied in policy. Welcomes requirement to consider sustainable drainage from the earliest stages. National Standards state that compliance should be demonstrated from the conception stage of the application (and cites national standards). References to KCC's sustainable drainage policy in point 2 needs amending - as surface and rainwater harvesting for non-potable re-use is not at the top of the drainage hierarchy in the National Standards. Water conservation (including rainwater/surface water harvesting) is essential in particularly important in light of the growth proposed in the Local Plan. Part 3 also needs correction to the National Standards eg no surface water drainage to the foul network is allowed. Southern Water will not permit any discharge of surface water from new development to a foul sewer (even if this was the point of discharge prior to the developmentof the site) and will resist surface water connections to a combined sewer. Requested wording for Part 1 of policy C9 as follows: Development proposals should, as relevant:a. Demonstrate that sustainable drainage has been considered and is compliant with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage from the earliest stages of scheme development and that schemes seek to provide multiple benefits to the environment and communities in terms of reducing the causes and impacts of flooding, improving water quality (removing pollutants from run-off) and water resources (water reuse, recharge to groundwater), adapting to climate change and enhancing biodiversity and amenity, as appropriate; Requested wording for Part 2 of policy C9: Planning applications for major development must be accompanied by site-specific drainage strategies to be approved by Kent County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Proposed drainage strategies should:a. Be in accordance with the standard run off hierarchy as set out in Paragraph 1.2 of the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage (2025).j. Minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protect water quality by providing SuDS designed to the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage (2025). Requested wording for Part 3 of policy C9: Planning applications for proposed development sites that meet with any of the following conditions:b. where the surface water currently discharges to a sewer (either surface water, combined or highway); or...shall only discharge at a rate equivalent to or below Qbar for all designed rainfall events. A staged discharge will not be acceptable. Compliance with this requirement will need to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Lead Local Flood Authority. Permission from the water company is required for any connection of surface water to any type of water company owned and operated sewer; early pre-planning engagement is advised.	The Council agrees, for the following reasons: Points 1.-6. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	11	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	The Parish Council supports Policy C9 in principle, particularly the strong requirements for sustainable drainage, biodiversity enhancement and compliance with Kent County Council's drainage standards. However, there are serious local concerns regarding: The increase in unauthorised development, including unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller sites; The absence of adequate drainage infrastructure on some illegal sites; The already poor drainage performance in parts of the local area; The cumulative strain placed on low-lying and marshland drainage systems. These issues should be more explicitly addressed within the policy framework. 1. Drainage Enforcement and Unauthorised Development Whilst Policy C9 sets high standards for new development, it does not address the real-world problem that: Unauthorised sites often proceed without approved drainage strategies; Drainage works are sometimes absent, inadequate or retrofitted poorly; This places additional strain on local ditches, culverts and pumping systems. The Parish Council supports the allocation of appropriate, well-designed and properly serviced Gypsy and Traveller sites. However, where provision is not delivered and unauthorised sites increase, there are clear drainage and environmental consequences.
2026Reg18/76	66	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Opposition Group				Support	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG strongly support the Policy C9.FPG believe that C9 "2g) Safeguard water quality" is include discharges to the Groundwater and any downstream watercourse. During Highsted Park the Applicant planned to discharge in over 600 boreholes to the groundwater, direct road run off to a Chalk Stream via an attenuation pond and areas around KSP where no plans were provided.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: Gives in principle support, however has serious local concerns. Some unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller sites proceed without adequate drainage or drainage poorly fitted. Places additional strain on local ditches, culverts and pumping stations with drainage and environmental consequences. Suggests additional wording to ensure drainage standards apply to retrospective and temporary permissions: "All development, including temporary or retrospective applications, must demonstrate compliance with sustainable drainage requirements. Where development has occurred without appropriate drainage infrastructure, remediation to an acceptable standard will be required." Concerned about cumulative impacts in low-lying areas where water does not drain naturally and relies on ditches, culverts and pumping infrastructure where even small increases in impermeable areas can cause increased flooding. C9 should be clearer on cumulative impacts, sensitivity of low-lying areas, the need for drainage betterment in constrained locations. Suggests policy is strengthened with reference to hardstanding incorporating permeable surfaces unless proven unfeasible/ surface water not directed to foul systems/direct discharge to ditches requiring proper attenuation and agreement. Requests assurances that maintenance will be legally secured/responsibility will be clearly assigned/enforcement action will be taken where drainage systems fail Supports properly allocated Gypsy and Traveller Sites with adequate drainage infrastructure and early liaison with the Lead Local Flood Authority.	The Council (partially) agrees, for the following reasons: Points 1.-6. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/76	Supports this policy for the following reasons: The safeguarding of water quality is at risk through development, as demonstrated through the application at Highsted Park with discharge to groundwater and a chalk stream.	Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/81	28	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Borden Parish Council				Object	There are serious concerns regarding the capacity and maintenance of existing drainage and sewer infrastructure serving the parish. There is evidence of systems operating at or beyond capacity, with incidents of overflow that appear to be linked to inadequate maintenance and insufficient network provision. Further development without confirmed and funded upgrades to drainage infrastructure will exacerbate flood risk, environmental harm, and potential public health issues. The Local Plan must require that: A full assessment of existing sewer and surface water capacity is undertaken prior to allocation or approval of development; Necessary upgrades are secured, funded, and delivered in advance of or alongside occupation of new dwellings; Ongoing maintenance responsibilities are clearly defined and enforced; and Development does not proceed where there is insufficient confirmed capacity within the drainage network. Drainage infrastructure must be treated as a fundamental element of infrastructure-led development, not as an issue to be addressed retrospectively. ANSWER DUPLICATED AT Q.66
2026Reg18/126	26	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Neither	Answer duplicated at question 66/67 Policy C9 – Sustainable Drainage Flood and Water Management Para 33.0.30 - The County Council would ask that this statement is made clearer in that the LMIDB only has jurisdiction for part of Swale, with the County Council's land drainage (consenting) authority for those areas outside the LMIDB area of jurisdiction. It is understood that this is explained elsewhere but it is felt that this sentence could be left to interpretation and it is therefore suggested that this is changed. Paragraph 34.0.9 - The County Council would advise that advice given under Policy C8 regarding DEFRA's new standards applies to all forms of development and so should also be considered alongside the requirements of the NPPF for all development proposals. Paragraph 34.0.12 - The County Council would advise that the comments made on DEFRA's new standards above applies to all forms of development and so should also be considered alongside the requirements of the NPPF for all development proposals. Paragraph 34.0.13 - The County Council would advise that DEFRA's new standards require all proposals to demonstrate interception of the first 5mm of any surface water rainfall on site as close to source as possible. Furthermore, the latest standards place emphasis on the pepper potting of SuDS features throughout any development proposals and that the use of pipe to large basin designs is no longer acceptable. The County Council would ask that this should be mentioned/reflected. In regard to Policy C9 1d - the County Council would comment that further to the climate change requirements of the Environment Agency (EA), the DEFRA standards set limitations in relation to rates of runoff inclusive of climate change adjustments. The County Council would ask that these are referenced (as set out under standard 3 - National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - GOV.UK) with a 'inclusive of any required climate change allowances as set by the EA' statement. Climate Change and Adaptation The County Council supports this policy, particularly in the context of adaptation and the numerous benefits provided from

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/81	Objects to this policy for the following reasons: Serious concerns about capacity and maintenance of the existing drainage and sewer infrastructure serving Borden parish, with systems operating at or beyond capacity and incidents of overflow that appear to be linked to inadequate maintenance and insufficient network provision. Further development, without upgrades, could exacerbate flood risk, environmental harm and public health. Drainage infrastructure must be treated as a fundamental element of infrastructure-led development, not to be addressed retrospectively. The Local Plan must require a full assessment of existing sewer and surface water capacity prior to allocation or approval of development/that upgrades are secured, funded and delivered in advance or alongside occupation of dwellings/ongoing maintenance is defined and enforced/development does not proceed where there is insufficient capacity in the network.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted. As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, Swale Borough Council undertakes a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and works with the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC), the Environment Agency and Southern Water on this. This looks at all sources of flooding across the borough. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/126	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: (See also comments to pre-ambles) Seeks reference (further to the climate change requirements of the Environment Agency (EA),) to the DEFRA standards which set limitations in relation to rates of runoff inclusive of climate change adjustments (see standard 3 - National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - GOV.UK) with a 'inclusive of any required climate change allowances as set by the EA' statement.) Supports references to multi-functional benefits.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Noted. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	27	Question 067 Do you support or object to Policy C9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Object	2.7.6.2 Policy criteriaRegarding the policy itself, we agree with most of the wording and only suggest that under 2i. it could be strengthened with the following wording: “Conserve and enhance biodiversity” to also safeguard what already exists.We advise that criterion 2 could be strengthened by quantifying the thresholds for major residential and non-residential development within the borough. We note that a definition of major development has not been provided in the Draft Plan. To align with NPPF requirements, we recommend that a definition of “major” development is provided, either within the policy or supporting text, in line with footnote 67 of the NPPF. This will help to strengthen the policy and therefore strengthen the decision-making that it informs.
2026Reg18/131	12	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Environment Agency		.	The Local Plan should place clearer obligations on applicants to evidence wastewater treatment capacity, storm overflow resilience, and phasing aligned with Southern Water’s DWMPs. Furthermore, while the narrative on Stodmarsh nutrient neutrality is accurate, the policy needs clearer mechanisms for nutrient budgets, long-term mitigation, and alignment with emerging strategic solutions. Paragraph 35.0.8: We support the acknowledgement of the presence and importance of protecting chalk streams; however this does not seem to carry into policy where they are not mentioned. It would be beneficial to bring chalk streams into this policy due to their sensitive nature.Paragraph 35.0.29: Consideration of the risk of the flooding of wastewater systems could also link in with the Storm Overflow Reduction Plan to explain the long-term plan to reduce storm discharges.Paragraph 35.0.30: We support that developments will be required to consider the impacts of development on water bodies and good that official guidance is being referenced. The assessment would consider ‘how the proposed development would affect a relevant water body in a river basin management plan’. It is not clear if this covers all the water bodies in the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 and if this should be specified in the policy.Paragraph 35.0.31: We support the requirement for a water quality assessment. It would be good to also consider the effects of drainage and making sure that the existing systems have capacity before development take place. In addition to the above comments, we have also identified 26 measures for water bodies in Swale. These are works that have been identified by the Environment Agency as being necessary for improving water bodies. Developers should work with us to confirm the details of the work that needs to be undertaken and ensure they are carried out to a good environmental standard.Please note that we are currently reviewing our water body measures therefore the list provided is provisional and subject to change, however it should give a good indication of the types of measures that are needed to improve each water body. Consented and published alongside the fourth River Basin		
2026Reg18/3	64	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Dunkirk Parish Council			Support subject to:35.0.14 should include Sarre Penn and Whitehall Dyke - both major tributaries of the Stour.35.0.21 This is where the Sarre Penn rises. Whitehall Dyke rises in Court Wood, South BleanDunkirk. Both feed the Stour and The Stodmarsh Nature Reserve.35.0.41 This doesn't happen or villages wouldn't continually suffer water outages and sewerage collapses		

Appen

We are awar

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support and seeks amendments, as follows: Agree with most of wording but suggests amending to 2i to 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity' to strengthen. Strengthen policy by quantifying thresholds for development (eg major for residential and non-residential/to align with the NPPF (footnote 67))	The Council (partially) agrees, for the following reasons: The criteria listed in point 2 of policy C9 are a repeat of policies in a KCC document - it is not within the Council's gift to amend that document, but this reference will be reviewed. Definitions of large and major development will be added to the glossary, as follows: Minor development: includes between 1 and 9 dwellings/ covers up to and including 0.5 hectares/ commercial development less than 1,000 square metres. Major development: includes 10-49 dwellings/ from 0.51 hectares up to and including 2 hectares/ commercial development between, 1000 and 4,999 square metres. Large major development: includes 50-249 dwellings/ from 2.1 hectares up to and including 5 hectares/ commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres. For information, Strategic major development: includes 250+ dwellings/ covers more than 5 hectares/ commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more Partial Change Agreed
2026Reg18/131	Comments on this preamble, as follows: LP should place clearer obligations on applicant to evidence waste water treatment capacity, storm overflow resilience and phasing aligned with SW's DWMPs. Preamble/policy needs clearer mechanisms for nutrient budgets, long term mitigation and alignment with emerging strategic solutions. Support reference to chalk streams in 35.0.8 but reference to chalk streams should be included in policy as well. Paragraph 35.0.29: Consideration of the risk of the flooding of wastewater systems could also link in with the Storm Overflow Reduction Plan to explain the long-term plan to reduce storm discharges. Paragraph 35.0.30: We support that developments will be required to consider the impacts of development on water bodies and good that official guidance is being referenced. The assessment would consider 'how the proposed development would affect a relevant water body in a river basin management plan'. It is not clear if this covers all the water bodies in the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 and if this should be specified in the policy. Paragraph 35.0.31: We support the requirement for a water quality assessment. It would be good to also consider the effects of drainage and making sure that the existing systems have capacity before development take place. EA has identified 26 measures for water bodies in Swale. These are works that have been identified by the Environment Agency as being necessary for improving water bodies. Developers should work with us to confirm the details of the work that needs to be undertaken and ensure they are carried out to a good environmental standard. EA are currently reviewing our water body measures therefore the list provided is provisional and subject to change, however it should give a good indication of the types of measures that are needed to improve each water body. Once created and published alongside the fourth River Basin Management Plans, the Programme of Measures for each water body should be used to identify suitable Measures that could take place to improve our water environment for both people and wildlife. Draft Programmes of Measures will be published in December 2026 for consultation, with the final version due to be published in December 2027. We strongly encourage you to include reference to the Programme of Measures within your Local Plan to help secure these environmental improvements.	The Council responds as follows: Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Reference to chalk streams is already included in Policy C10. Further reference will be discussed with the Environment Agency. This list has been taken from Southern Water's DWMP. Additional text will be discussed with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in collaboration with the Environment Agency. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/3	Gives (qualified) support for the following reasons: 35.0.14 should include Sarre Penn and Whitehall Dyke - tributaries of the Stour/Stodmarsh Nature Reserve. The early engagement with water companies - to ensure timely capacity (as set out in 35.0.14) does not take place as evidenced by water outages and sewerage collapses.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: The Sarre Penn and Whitehall Dyke are in the Stour Management/Stodmarsh Catchment and thus not referenced in 35.0.14, which is about the North Kent Catchment. Reference to the Stour Catchment will be added to paragraph 35.0.8. Noted - Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/53	6	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Southern Water Services Ltd			The sections from 35.0.28 – 35.0.29 discuss responsibilities rather broadly, without mentioning the other organisations that have responsibility for flooding. This could be misleading to many readers who'd then assume that water companies are responsible for reducing all types of flooding – which they are not. These sections also refer to the DWMP (for which studies concluded in 2023) that informed business plans for the current water industry investment period AMP8 (2025-2030). This information is therefore now dated and does not relate to the evolving local plan, but to the growth coming forward from the adopted local plan at that time. The DWMP is now being further developed to inform investment needs for AMP9 and will be maintained into the future in line with the growth coming forward from adopted local plans. Water companies plan investment to accommodate the growth forecast in local plans. To best support our planning, we ideally need routine shares of housing trajectories in readily usable formats with geospatial data we can link to our catchments and asset service boundaries. Please note that we assess our strategic assets - for example annually for wastewater treatment works (WTWs) using growth forecast by 5-year housing land supply trajectories, adopted Local Plans and third-party analysis of growth forecasts. This feeds into asset investment planning generally, including the Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan that informs the next 5-year water industry business plan cycle, where Ofwat reviews the evidence we present to justify our investment. Tension can therefore arise where housing trajectories are not appropriately updated, or where new housing is progressed outside of Plans as 'windfall'. To assist in these scenarios then, where consulted, Southern Water also assesses capacity to serve individual development sites at planning application stage. Should our assessment identify a constraint of some kind, we will plan the work necessary to serve that development working with the developer on timings. It is the granting of planning permission and the developer applications to connect that confirms and funds our more detailed planning of local interventions that may be needed. To support this process? We continue to offer Local Planning		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/53	Comments as follows: No mention of other organisations, apart from water companies, and responsibilities for flooding. Could be misleading. DWMPs is being updated and so this section is now dated. Sets out the process for accommodating growth forecast in local plans and planning applications. Stresses that Southern Water offers LPAs capacity checks at planning consultation stage (even though not statutory consultee) and that developers can also use the pre-app service. Requests link to Pre-App service is included in para 35.0.27. Notes that system works well in dry weather conditions, but is stressed through climate change and urban creep - a problem that needs to be tackled at source, including through working in partnership with LPAs.	The Council comments as follows: The preamble to Policy C8 on Flood Risk sets out the bodies and their responsibilities with regard flood risk. This doesn't need to be repeated in this policy. Reference to the Environment Agency's strategic oversight will be added to the preamble to C8. References to updates to DWMP and AMP9 will be included in preamble. Agree - Link to pre-application services will be added to para 35.0.27 or nearby paragraph. Noted - Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	85	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council supports the overall direction of the preamble, particularly its alignment with: The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024); National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems; Environment Agency groundwater protection guidance; Kent County Council drainage and water management policies; The recognition that Swale is an area of serious water stress. The preamble is comprehensive and evidence-based. However, it could be made more focussed, locally relatable and clearer for communities in the following ways. 1. Stronger Local Framing at the Start The opening paragraphs are clear but could be strengthened by: Bringing the "serious water stress" designation forward earlier in the text; Clearly stating that Swale's growth must operate within environmental limits; Highlighting that water scarcity and water quality are already affecting residents (hosepipe bans, drying chalk streams, sewage discharge concerns). Making the issue more locally tangible would help communities understand why stronger standards are required. 2. Clearer Explanation of Wastewater Capacity Constraints The preamble correctly references Southern Water's Drainage and Wastewater		
2026Reg18/74	29	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	Should this be titled Potable Water to make it distinct from other water sources and types in which case is section 8 referring to conditions for abstraction or discharge?Is section 9 clear on whether the requirement is for a maximum consumption of 100 litres per day of potable water or a discharge from a household of 100 litres per day of waste water. Note as a planning condition it is unclear how a developer can achieve this without applying water restrictive devices on a development that may be discriminatory to certain vulnerable persons.Excellent language on chalk streams. Now those principles just need to be translated into actions, in particular reduced abstraction to mitigate its disastrous effect on water flow and water quality in chalk streams.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified support for the preamble: Due to alignment with national and local policy - it is comprehensive and evidence-based. Could be strengthened. Suggests stronger local framing (eg around water stress, environmental limits, effect on residents/chalk streams/climate impacts etc) Suggests clearer explanation of wastewater capacity constraints and limits on development/phasing/right to connect Suggests stronger emphasis on chalk streams (rarity, pressures, cumulative impacts) to justify stricter water efficient standards. Clearer explanation of Nutrient Neutrality and what it means for applicants. Make stronger case for water efficiency standard Make clearer link between water resources/wastewater capacity and development phasing Make it more accessible with sub-headings/key point boxes/reduced repetition	Noted and agreed in principle. Change Proposed. Preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of comments made and in collaboration with the Environment Agency.
2026Reg18/74	Neither supports nor objects to this preamble but comments: Should this be titled Potable Water to make it distinct from other water sources? Is it clear that the water efficiency standard relates to potable water not waste water? Note that water restrictive devises may be discriminatory to certain vulnerable persons. Excellent language on chalk streams - now need to reduce abstraction to mitigate harm.	The Council (partially) agrees, as follows: It is not clear what this comment is referring to but the preamble will be reviewed and extra headings will be inserted to improve clarity. Water efficiency standards are generally understood to relate to improving efficiency in water supply but a reference to 'water consumption' will be added to the policy/preamble. Noted. Customers on Water Company Priority Services Registers with medical or mobility needs, including Blue Badge holders, are exempt from Temporary Use Bans. If further exemptions are required, this should be set out through planning applications. Noted. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/76	67	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). The preamble seems complex to the layperson, if does feel like it needs clearer internal structuring so that decision-makers and applicants can clearly distinguish potable water supply issues from water quality / environmental protection issues.Across Swale there have been number of issues with both Wastewater at both Teynham and Sittingbourne and Potable Water with both Southern Water and South East Water.Wastewater with increased pollution discharges to Milton Creek from Sittingbourne Wastewater Treatment and sewage flooding Frognal Lane Teynham.Potable Water issues with Southern Water and the Isle Sheppey water supply issues over recent summers and those experienced by South East Water over in January 2026 demonstrate the fragility of Water Supplies. Water supply and it's protection should be key to future development.The impacts on both Wastewater and Potable Water appear to have been caused by the cumulative impact of development with insufficient investment growth in the infrastructure. We schemes that are outside of the local plan should not be promoted until there is proof that the networks can cope with these additional demands.Paragraph 35.0.14 fails to mention the significant volume of chalk streams and other watercourses that originate from the North Downs and flow in the creeks, the Medway and The Swale.		
2026Reg18/82	15	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?					SARAH	MOAKES	At § 35.0.29 it is stated that 'Southern Water's analysis has identified challenges for the North KentCatchment, highlights of which include....new development in the North Kent Catchment might putadditional pressure on internationally designated habitat sites at the Medway and Swale Estuaries.Solutions will need to be found to ensure that development is nutrient neutral.' Clarification is needed. Does this mean nutrient neutrality is required in these areas or not? Despite having an existing policy in its armouryDM 21 which requires applicants to 'demonstratethat there is adequate water supply, drainage and wastewater connect ion and treatmentinfrastructure...in place before construction commences and that these details have been approved bythe appropriate water company and funded by the development where appropriate', it is simply neverenforced; planning officers invariably disregard the question of wastewater capacity by insisting itis 'not a planning matter.' True, developers have a right of connection to the foul sewer yet it wouldbe perfectly legitimate to impose a Grampian condition to ensure the necessary improvements weresecured in advance of occupation (the so called 'Wealden' condition.) To knowingly turn a blind eyeto this issue is moreover a complete breach of NPPF paragraph 187e. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF statesthat 'Strategic policies should...make sufficient provision for...infrastructure for...water supply,wastewater.' Ultimately it is the LPA's responsibility to ensure their plans for strategic growth align with the latter's Asset Management Plans, updated every five years. The PPG recommends that LPAs u ndertake a water cycle study as part of their local plan evidencebase to help 'plan for sustainable growth'. The fact that, shockingly, SBC has not carried out a watercycle study since 2010 (Scott Wilson) raises troubling questions about the soundness of its local plan.Given that Faversham's Victorian sewage was deemed to be operating at capacity back in 2010 – before the building boom of recent years got underway – it is hardly going to be able to cope with a doubling of the town's population that is now threatened. The future of its chalk streams meanwhile will be catastrophically impacted by the		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/76	Comments on the preamble as follows: Preamble is complex - needs clearer internal structuring to distinguish between potable water supply issues and water quality/environmental issues. Wastewater issues at Teynham (sewage flooding at Frognal Lane) and Sittingbourne (discharges to Milton Creek) and potable water with SW and SEW (Isle of Sheppey (recent summers) and mainland in January 2026). Water supply is key to future development and issues have been caused by insufficient investment in infrastructure. Local Plan growth should not be promoted until proof that networks can cope. Paragraph 35.0.14 fails to mention chalk streams and other watercourses which flow from North Downs to the Medway and Swale.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Agree the preamble is complex. This reflects the complexity of the issues and the interrelationship between water resources and water quality. The Council will insert additional headings to help make the preamble clearer. The text will be updated to reflect recent incidents and the latest evidence. Paragraph 35.0.14 covers the issues included in the Catchment Improvement Group's action plan and as such it would not be appropriate to amend as suggested. It should be noted that several of the watercourses mentioned do flow from the Downs to the Medway/Swale, as mentioned in 35.0.8. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/82	Comments on the preamble as follows: Para 35.0.29 and reference to the need to 'ensure that development is nutrient neutral' suggests nutrient neutrality is required in these areas. Clarification is needed. Existing policy DM21 which requires developers to demonstrate adequate water supply, drainage and wastewater connection is never enforced and is disregarded by planning officers as 'not a planning matter'. Agree developer have a right of connection but it would be legitimate to impose a Grampian condition (as has been done via the Wealden condition). Not to do so is in conflict with para 187e of the NPPF. Ultimately, it is the LPA's responsibility to ensure plans for strategic growth align with the Asset Management Plans of water companies. PPG recommends that LPAs undertake water cycle studies as part of evidence gathering. This was last done for Swale in 2010 when it was suggested that this was a 'living document'. Question of soundness that this hasn't been undertaken. Faversham sewage system was at capacity in 2010, before 'building boom'. Will not cope with doubling of town's population. Chalk streams threatened. 100l water efficiency standard will not help, especially as smart metering has found that water consumption in new builds were in excess of current standards. Review of Water Efficiency Standards in the Building Regulations 2010 - Defra - Citizen Space Quotes draft NPPF and inclusion of reference to Chalk Streams. Council should improve protection of these waterbodies. White Drain in Boughton has poor ecological status due to regular sewage spills from SW's combined sewer outfall at Stocker's Hill. As such,it is imperative that any housing development within the relevant catchment area Boughton/Dunkirk, Hernhill, Selling be obliged to make use of an onsite sewage treatment plant lest it overburden the network any further.	The Council responds as follows: Noted. This will be followed up with Southern Water. Noted. This will be followed up with the Development Management Team. Noted. Consultation with the water companies is an ongoing part of the development of the Local Plan. The 2025 Water Cycle Study for Swale was not progressed due to unresolved issues over methodology. However, the Council carries out ongoing dialogue with water companies, the Environment Agency, our Habitats Regulations Assessment consultants, our Viability Consultants, and other bodies to inform the development of the Local Plan. Noted. Noted. The poor ecological status of the White Drain will be addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Local Plan policies if necessary. Reference to the ecological status of the White Drain will be added to the preamble to C10. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/126	27	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning	Policy C10 – Water Quality and Water Resources Paragraph 35.0.23 – The County Council considers that the Stodmarsh Nutrient Neutrality Strategy.pdf has now been completed, which SBC is asked to consider the impacts of this document.Paragraph 35.0.39 – The County Council is pleased to note the aspiration for a water efficiency standard requiring a for properties to not exceed 110l/d.Energy and AdaptationThe County Council would recommend adding in the incorporation of water efficiency/saving measures such as rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling in both new and existing developments.		
2026Reg18/127	28	Question 068 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.7.7 C10 Water quality and Water Resources2.7.7.1 PreambleNatural England supports this policy. We note that a portion of the borough lies within the Stodmarsh catchment. We advise that as the site allocation process progresses it may be suitable to undertake a plan-level nutrient budget calculation for those sites that lie within the Stodmarsh catchment in order to understand the level of mitigation that may be required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality. Further information on nutrient neutrality can be found within Natural England's March 2022 advice.Potential mitigation could include the provision of credits from agreed strategic mitigation schemes (such as credits available from the Stour Environmental Credits Ltd trading platform), and/or provision of onsite mitigation for larger development sites where appropriate. Where onsite or offsite mitigation is considered at the next Plan stage, we support consideration as to how these sites could generate maximum gains for both people and nature. For example, consideration of the most appropriate measures in light of the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and potential provision of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) units, as appropriate for individual allocations.Natural England advises that there are opportunities to 'stack' additional environmental benefits (such as BNG) with nutrient mitigation measures. Further guidance on stacking other environmental benefits with nutrient mitigation is available here. In addition, further high levels guidance on stacking can be found on the British Standards Institution website.We recognise that Kent County Council is in the process of developing a Stodmarsh catchment strategy, which will provide the latest supply and demand analysis for nutrient mitigation. This strategy is expected to be a key reference document at the Regulation 19 stage of plan preparation. Natural England wish to signpost published guidance on design principles for nutrient mitigation which are not currently referenced on your authority's nutrient mitigation webpage. These include:-NECR544 Nutrient Mitigation Tool - NECR544-Information on Nature Based Solutions as Nutrient Mitigation - NBS2024-NECR590 Edition 1 Enhanced Drainage Ditch Management: A framework approach for nutrient neutrality - NECR590-NECR591 Edition 1		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/126	Comments on the preamble, as follows: Advise that Stodmarsh Nutrient Neutrality Strategy is complete - SBC is asked to consider impacts of this document. Pleased to note water efficiency standard of 110l/d. Recommend adding incorporation of water saving measures such as rainwater harvesting/greywater recycling in new and existing developments.	The Council responds as follows: Reference to Stodmarsh NN Strategy will be included in preamble. Target is 100/pp/day. Reference to rainwater harvesting/greywater recycling is already included in preamble at 35.0.35 Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/127	Supports this policy for the following reasons: Note portion of borough in Stodmarsh catchment. May be suitable to undertake plan-level nutrient budget calculation for allocations within the Stodmarsh catchment in order to understand mitigation required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality (eg credits from Stour Environmental Credits Ltd and or onsite mitigation.) Where onsite mitigation is considered at Plan stage NE support consideration of how sites could generate maximum gains for people and nature (eg links to Kent LNRS/provision of BNG and stacking generally - links to guidance are provided.) KCC is developing a Stodmarsh Catchment Strategy (supply and demand analysis for nutrient mitigation) which will be a key reference document at the Regulation 19 stage. Signpost to new NE guidance on Nutrient Neutrality for website. Paragraph 35.0.20, note that Natural England is responsible for managing the Stodmarsh National Nature Reserve (NNR). However, the NNR forms only part of the Stodmarsh designated sites. The reserve covers 241 hectares, whereas the full designated area extends to 623 hectares, most of which is privately owned and managed.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Preamble will be reviewed and updated in light of this information. Website will be updated with NE advice. Paragraph 35.0.20 will be reviewed and updated in light of this information. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/131	17	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Environment Agency		.		Neither	We welcome the inclusion of this policy but consider that it requires strengthening to ensure full compliance with the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and national policy. In particular, the policy must explicitly require development to demonstrate no deterioration in WFD status, support delivery of relevant River Basin Management Plan measures, and provide detailed water quality assessments where hydrological or ecological receptors may be affected, including chalk streams, groundwater Source Protection Zones, and sensitive estuarine habitats. This appears to be a good, detailed policy covering the main issues of water supply and quality issues, although it is not always clear how it is linking with some of the issues raised in the preamble.Point 4 – it is good that there is consideration for the current and future capacity of drainage for any new developments. Point 5 goes into more details as to how this will be achieved. The council should liaise with water companies to ensure that there is sufficient capacity for new developments and to ensure that there are improvements to the infrastructure if these are needed.For points 6 and 7, which deal with non-mains drainage, it is good that the site is trying to limit the discharge rate. It would be good to include wording that these methods of waste disposal should only be used where there is no other option. This is implied with the wording in point 6 but the wording could be stronger. There are no points in the policy that explicitly say that package treatment plants or other non-mains drainage should be avoided. This includes New Appointments and Variations (NAVs).Wording for point 7 could be adjusted to ‘Where onsite package treatment works are the only remaining option to deal with foul sewage after discounting connection to the main sewerage network’.Policy should make a mention of drainage hierarchy and link into Policy C9 Sustainable Drainage.The policy also mentions about limiting the amount of discharge but has no restrictions on where the waste is being discharged to. Discharge into dry ditches should be avoided and there should be consideration of the effects of discharge on vulnerable water bodies, particularly chalk streams.
2026Reg18/3	65	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Dunkirk Parish Council				Support	Support subject to C10.8 'In areas within the catchment of Stodmarsh Nature Reserve.....'. Thiswould exclude Winterbourne Fields.In areas within the catchment of Stodmarsh Nature Reserve, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will achieve nutrient neutrality through appropriate mitigation measures.Sarre Penn and Whitehall Dyke both rise at Winterbourne and Court Wood.CHALK STREAMS IN THE STOUR CATCHMENT - Kentish Stour
2026Reg18/11	7	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?					jennifer	anderson		Neither	10b should include wording:- not result in a drop in water pressure for neighbouringproperties

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/131	Gives qualified support for this policy: Good detailed policy, but not always sure how policy deals with issues in preamble. Needs strengthening to ensure full compliance with Water Framework Directive and national policy by requiring demonstration of no deterioration in WFD status, the support for delivery of River Basin Management Plan measures and provide Water Quality Assessments where hydrological or ecological receptors may be affected, including Chalk Streams, Source Protection Zones and sensitive estuarine habitats. Welcome point 4. Council should liaise with water companies to ensure there is sufficient capacity for new developments to ensure improvements to infrastructure where needed. Wording in 6 (and 7) could be stronger/clearer and make clear that package treatment plants or other non-mains drainage should be avoided. Suggests wording for point 7 as follows: 'Where onsite package treatment works are the only remaining option to deal with foul sewage after discounting connection to the main sewerage network'. Policy should mention drainage hierarchy and link to policy C9 Sustainable Drainage. Policy should explain that discharge to dry ditches should be avoided there should be consideration of the effects of discharge on vulnerable water bodies, particularly chalk streams'	The Council agrees: Noted. Preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted. Noted. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Agree - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/3	Supports this policy, and comments: Supports point 8 and notes presence of Sarre Penn and Whitehall Dyke.	The Council agrees, for the following reasons: Noted. Reference to Sarre Penn/Whitehall Dyke will be added to the preamble. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/11	Neither supports nor objects to this policy: 10b should include wording to prevent loss of water pressure in neighbouring properties.	Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/12	23	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?					Carol	Jacobs		Neither	We can no longer assume that we will be able to be provided with clean water in this part of the country. On that basis any future development would be refused permission on that basis alone.
2026Reg18/16	22	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham		Neither	§ 5 Consider adding 'The Council reserves the right to impose Grampian conditions to this end.' Swale has no published planning guidance for non-mains drainage systems. Is this something it should address?
2026Reg18/40	73	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	In light of the recent failure of South East Water to supply water to thousands of residents in Kent, including Bredgar, Policy C10, paragraph 2, should be strengthened to additionally require water companies to provide signed confirmation of their capacity to supply potable water and process foul sewage before any large development planning application is considered. The policy should also clearly define the development size at which this confirmation is required, in order to avoid ambiguity about when the requirement is mandatory. The recent experience of Kent's extreme vulnerability to loss of water supply illuminates the vital importance of protecting the existing groundwater sources that supply Swale. The picture below shows the water source protection zones. New developments over agricultural land in those zones should be avoided. If developments are considered essential they should not contain any infrastructure that might contaminate the ground water sources. I.E. Waste disposal or sewage management sites etc. See: Water source protection zones in Swale. Shown in three zones - SPZ1, SPZ2 & SPZ3. Source https://www.gov.uk/guidance/groundwater-source-protection-zones-spzs .

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/12	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: We can no longer assume that we can be provided with clean water in the south east and future development should be refused on that basis.	Noted. The Local Plan is prepared in consultation with the relevant water companies and Policy C10 has been written to help ensure that new development will not exceed the capacity of the local infrastructure. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/16	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Consider adding requirement for Grampian condition. Should Swale publish planning guidance for non-mains drainage?	The Council (partially) agrees, for the following reasons: This point will be considered in light of a review of this policy and preamble. Guidance on non-mains drainage has been published by the Environment Agency and does not need to be replicated by the Council. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.
2026Reg18/40	Gives qualified support for this policy: Requests that additional requirement is added to point 2 to require water companies to provide signed confirmation of their capacity to supply potable water and process foul sewage before large planning applications are considered. Size threshold for this should be set out in policy. New development on agricultural land in Source Protection Zones should be avoided. If essential they should not contain any infrastructure which might contaminate groundwater.	Noted. Noted. The Council agrees to review this preamble and policy, in light of comments made and in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. Any amendments will be reflected in the Regulation 19 Local Plan document.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/48	5	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Teynham Parish Council				Support	Teynham Parish Council supports the objectives of these policies but considers that Policy C10 requires strengthening to ensure effective protection of infrastructure and the environment. Water Lifecycle and Capacity as a Development Constraint In Teynham the management of wastewater operates under significant constraints. Across Kent there have been multiple examples of fresh water supply issues. Teynham Parish Council recommends that the policy clearly state that development should only proceed where: ? Sufficient Fresh Water Resource and Supply Capacity exists: Proof must be provided that the local network can deliver required volumes and maintain water pressure without detrimental impact on existing residents or the local aquifer; and? Sufficient Wastewater Infrastructure Capacity exists: Evidence must be provided that the network can accept additional flows without increasing the risk of sewer flooding or storm overflow discharges. Where capacity is lacking, necessary upgrades must be fully funded and secured. Reliance on uncertain or aspirational infrastructure improvements should be avoided. The Parish Council advocates for the use of Grampian Conditions to ensure that no dwellings are occupied until both the supply and discharge infrastructure are fully operational and verified. Cumulative Infrastructure Impact Assessment Teynham Parish Council considers that infrastructure constraints often arise from cumulative development rather than individual proposals. Policy C10 should require assessment of cumulative impacts at settlement level to ensure infrastructure capacity is not exceeded. The Parish Council advocates for the use of Grampian Conditions to ensure that no dwellings are occupied until the necessary wastewater capacity upgrades are fully operational. Catchment-Based and Nature-Based Solutions Teynham Parish Council strongly supports catchment-based approaches and

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/48	Gives qualified support for this policy: Policy requires strengthening. In Teynham the wastewater system operates under significant constraints and across Kent there have been multiple supply issues. Seek amendments to ensure development only proceeds when: Sufficient water resource supply capacity exists - proof must be provided Sufficient wastewater capacity exists - evidence must be provided that there is no risk to sewer flooding/storm overflow. Where development is lacking upgrades must be fully funded and secured. Grampian Conditions should be used to ensure no dwellings are occupied before supply and discharge are verified as operational. Policy should require cumulative assessment of impacts at settlement level. Teynham PC support catchment-based approaches and nature based solutions to improve water quality, reduce flood risk, support biodiversity, enhance environmental quality.	The Council agrees, as follows: Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. The preamble and policy C10 will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/53	7	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Water Services Ltd				Neither	Southern Water is the wastewater service provider for the Swale district, supplying water to parts of the district. Southern Water acknowledges the broad range of content in this policy, for which our comments are also therefore broad – covering additional concerns to protect water quality and also the processes and rules that govern the funding cycles and timing of water industry asset investment. Requested wording for Part 1 of policy C10: Please could the following wording be added to point 1 of policy C10 to acknowledge the need for delivery of watertight foul systems that are essential to areas of high groundwater the draft Plan acknowledges in places: (1e) Design and construction must also ensure a watertight foul system. Requested wording for Part 3 of policy C10: Please could the following wording be added to point 3 of policy C10: 3(a) For development within Source Protection Zones please see Southern Water's SuDS in SPZ guidance here - https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/0oubtggs/suds-in-spzguidance.pdf 3(c) Developments will not be supported unless they contain details of the measures that will be taken in the construction phase to ensure that polluted runoff (including suspended sediment) does not leave the site. Temporary trade effluent consents can be granted by the appropriate wastewater service provider to help ensure lawful discharge from building sites. Requested wording for Part 5 of policy C10: Please could the following wording be changed to point 5 of policy C10 for alignment with water industry asset investment planning and 5-year periods, with additional content protecting existing assets: 5. Major development intending to connect to mains drainage and wastewater systems must demonstrate how the development will be phased and ensure no occupation until all necessary works relating to water and wastewater have been carried out. The utility network should be protected and development proposals that would compromise existing utilities infrastructure or approach or future

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/53	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Notes broad range of content and therefore responds broadly. Requests wording to be added as point 1e) 'Design and construction must also ensure a watertight foul system.' (essential in areas of high groundwater). Requests addition of wording to point 3: 'For development within Source Protection Zones please see Southern Water's SuDS in SPZ guidance here -https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/00ubtgg/suds-in-spzguidance.pdf and 'Developments will not be supported unless they contain details of the measures that will be taken in the construction phase to ensure that polluted runoff (including suspended sediment) does not leave the site. Temporary trade effluent consents can be granted by the appropriate wastewater service provider to help ensure lawful discharge from building sites.' Requests addition of wording to point 5: Major development intending to connect to mains drainage and wastewater systems must demonstrate how the development will be phased and ensure no occupation until all necessary works relating to water and wastewater have been carried out. The utility network should be protected and development proposals that would compromise existing utilities infrastructure, or encroach on future connections for utilities, will be refused. Opportunities should be sought to safeguard the provision of utilities wherever possible.' Or request a new policy on Infrastructure Safeguarding. Gives additional explanation as to need for protection of areas of high groundwater, Source Protection Zones and trade effluent (which could be added to preamble?). Repeats the comments made in the preamble. SW cannot see how the current policy could be applied in practice to water company operations and infrastructure planning. Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker. There is a separate statutory regime governing the provision of sewerage and wastewater treatment under the Water Industry Act 1991 and local planning authorities should not seek to duplicate the roles and responsibilities of the statutory undertaker. Request additional wording in this policy to better safeguard the essential function of Wastewater Treatment Works, and locating development adjacent or near to an existing WTW could compromise Southern Water's ability to continue to serve growth in the district. Southern Water may have to provide additional wastewater infrastructure to serve new and existing customers and continue to meet stricter environmental standards. It is likely that there would be limited options to locate infrastructure as it needs to connect to existing networks. Planning policy should help to safeguard the strategic infrastructure necessary to sustainable development and support proposals to deliver additional infrastructure. Quotes NPPF, paras 7 and 9.	The Council (partially) agrees: Noted. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. The Council does not understand this comment and will seek clarification from Southern Water. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Noted - preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	17	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Eastchurc h Parish Council	Sarah	Poole		Support	The Parish Council supports the intent of Policy C10, particularly: The catchment-based approach; Protection of chalk streams and groundwater; The requirement for nutrient neutrality; The 100 litres per person per day water efficiency standard; Stronger wastewater infrastructure requirements before occupation. However, we have serious concerns regarding water supply resilience on the Isle of Sheppey, particularly in light of: The designation of Swale as an area of serious water stress; Recent water outages and supply interruptions affecting residents; Increasing development pressure; Climate change impacts and prolonged dry periods. The policy should go further to address long-term water security for the Island. 1. Water Supply Resilience – Isle of Sheppey The Isle of Sheppey is geographically constrained and vulnerable. Residents have experienced: Recent supply interruptions;
2026Reg18/76	68	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Oppositio n Group				Support	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). Could use subheadings to make it easier for the layperson and developer to read.There should be proof that there is sufficient capacity with both Wastewater and Potable Water networks. Where there is insufficient capacity then the use of a Grampian condition should be made to prevent occupation of dwellings. The appropriate Potable Water supplier should be consulted by the Applicant, i.e. South East Water or Southern Water. In Highsted Park they consulted the wrong water authority and Swale didn't pick it up.It must also identify infrastructure that might contaminate the ground water sources eg waste disposal or sewage management sites etc.Figure: Water source protection zones in Swale. Shown in three zones - SPZ1, SPZ2 & SPZ3. Source https://www.gov.uk/guidance/groundwater-source-protection-zones-spzs. Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Gives qualified support for this policy and suggests amendments: Supports catchment-based approach, emphasis on chalk streams/groundwater, reference to nutrient neutrality, water efficiency standards, wastewater infrastructure before occupation. Serious concerns around water supply on Sheppey (water stress/recent shortages and low pressure/development pressures/climate impacts. Policy should go further to ensure development does not outpace water supply infrastructure and is resilient - requiring clearer evidence that water companies can demonstrate capacity before planning permission is granted. Suggests feasibility study for desalination plant on Sheppey and sets out argument. Point 5 should be strengthened - no occupation until water supply/wastewater capacity is fully operational/phasing conditions are enforceable/supply resilience is demonstrated (not simply connection rights). Suggests new wording: "Development proposals must demonstrate that sufficient and resilient water supply capacity exists, taking account of cumulative growth and climate change projections." "Where supply resilience is constrained, development will be phased to align with delivery of strategic water infrastructure." "In areas of serious water stress, strategic options including new supply infrastructure (such as desalination, water recycling or regional transfers) should be explored and evidenced through Water Resources Management Plans."	Noted Noted and will be reviewed. Noted. Southern Water/Water Resources South East could be contacted about such a study. Noted and will be reviewed. Noted and will be reviewed. Partial Change Proposed. Preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of comments made and in collaboration with the Environment Agency.
2026Reg18/76	Gives conditional support for this policy and comments: Subheadings will make reading easier. Proof of capacity for supply and waste water should be provided ahead of occupation eg by using Grampian Condition. Quotes example of Highsted Park where wrong water company was consulted. Infrastructure that might contaminate groundwater sources (Source Protection Zone) must be identified. Includes map.	The Council (partially agrees for the following reasons). Subheadings could be useful and will be considered in updates to this policy. The use of Grampian style conditions are being discussed with the Development Management team. References to the maps of SPZs are included in the preamble at 35.0.16. Preamble and policy will be reviewed in light of these comments and with further collaboration with the Environment Agency. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/82	16	Question 069 Do you support or object to Policy C10? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?					SARAH	MOAKES		Neither	At § 35.0.29 it is stated that ‘Southern Water’s analysis has identified challenges for the North Kent Catchment, highlights of which include....new development in the North Kent Catchment might put additional pressure on internationally designated habitat sites at the Medway and Swale Estuaries. Solutions will need to be found to ensure that development is nutrient neutral.’ Clarification is needed. Does this mean nutrient neutrality is required in these areas or not? Despite having an existing policy in its armoury DM 21 which requires applicants to ‘demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, drainage and wastewater connect ion and treatment infrastructure...in place before construction commences and that these details have been approved by the appropriate water company and funded by the development where appropriate’, it is simply never enforced; planning officers invariably disregard the question of wastewater capacity by insisting it is ‘not a planning matter.’ True, developers have a right of connection to the foul sewer yet it would be perfectly legitimate to impose a Grampian condition to ensure the necessary improvements were secured in advance of occupation (the so called ‘Wealden’ condition.) To knowingly turn a blind eye to this issue is moreover a complete breach of NPPF paragraph 187e. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF states that ‘Strategic policies should...make sufficient provision for...infrastructure for...water supply, wastewater.’ Ultimately it is the LPA’s responsibility to ensure their plans for strategic growth align with the latter’s Asset Management Plans, updated every five years. The PPG recommends that LPAs undertake a water cycle study as part of their local plan evidence base to help ‘plan for sustainable growth’. The fact that, shockingly, SBC has not carried out a water cycle study since 2010 (Scott Wilson) raises troubling questions about the soundness of its local plan. Given that Faversham’s Victorian sewage was deemed to be operating at capacity back in 2010 – before the building boom of recent years got underway – it is hardly going to be able to cope with a doubling of the town’s population that is now threatened. The future of its chalk streams meanwhile will be catastrophically impacted by the
2026Reg18/127	41	Question 070 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	SEE Annex 5: Natural England’s Standard Advice for Air Quality Impacts for Local Plans IN ATTACHED DOCUMENT		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/82	Neither supports nor objects, but comments as follows: Para 35.0.29 and reference to the need to 'ensure that development is nutrient neutral' suggests nutrient neutrality is required in these areas. Clarification is needed. Existing policy DM21 which requires developers to demonstrate adequate water supply, drainage and wastewater connection is never enforced and is disregarded by planning officers as 'not a planning matter'. Agree developer have a right of connection but it would be legitimate to impose a Grampian condition (as has been done via the Wealden condition). Not to do so is in conflict with para 187e of the NPPF. Ultimately, it is the LPA's responsibility to ensure plans for strategic growth align with the Asset Management Plans of water companies. PPG recommends that LPAs undertake water cycle studies as part of evidence gathering. This was last done for Swale in 2010 when it was suggested that this was a 'living document'. Question of soundness that this hasn't been undertaken. Faversham sewage system was at capacity in 2010, before 'building boom'. Will not cope with doubling of town's population. Chalk streams threatened. 100l water efficiency standard will not help, especially as smart metering has found that water consumption in new builds were in excess of current standards. Review of Water Efficiency Standards in the Building Regulations 2010 - Defra - Citizen Space Quotes draft NPPF and inclusion of reference to Chalk Streams. Council should improve protection of these waterbodies. White Drain in Boughton has poor ecological status due to regular sewage spills from SW's combined sewer outfall at Stocker's Hill. As such,it is imperative that any housing development withinthe relevant catchment area Boughton/Dunkirk, Hernhill, Selling be obliged to make use of an onsite sewage treatment plant lest it overburden the network any further.	The Council responds as follows: Noted - This will be followed up with Southern Water. Noted - This will be followed up with the Development Management Team. Noted - Consultation with the water companies is an ongoing part of the development of the Local Plan. The PPG sets out that Water Cycle Studies are voluntary. The 2025 Water Cycle Study for Swale was not progressed due to unresolved issues over methodology. However, the Council carries out ongoing dialogue with water companies, the Environment Agency, our Habitats Regulations Assessment consultants, our Viability Consultants, and other bodies to inform the development of the Local Plan. Noted - Noted - The poor ecological status of the White Drain will be addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Local Plan policies if necessary. Reference to the ecological status of the White Drain will be added to the preamble to C10. Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/127	Neither supports nor objects to the preamble, but comments: Include reference to Natural England's standing advice on air pollution and development. Air pollution and development: advice for local authorities - GOV.UK References the need to consider AQ in an overarching assessment of the LP's cumulative impacts. SA/HRA should consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment from emissions and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures. Technical guidance is available but habitat sites and SSSIs as risk are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic. Caselaw should also be considered. Advice covers the following pollutants: ammonia, nitrogen oxide, nitrogen deposition, acid deposition, sulphur dioxide. The sequential approach to air quality assessments has the following stages - initial screening for risk (distance criteria, qualifying habitat) - detailed AQ modelling (Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System) - applying screening - detailed assessment of ecological impacts - appropriate assessment for habitat sites to determined whether (including mitigation)Include an Annex which sets out that: Note: Air Quality modelling for LPs should include relevant scenarios that are clearly identified. Allowance advised for windfall development - see IAQM advice air-quality-impacts-on-nature-sites-2020.pdf	Noted. Reference to standard advice will be added to preamble. Noted. Advice will be considered as part of transport modelling / Habitats Regulation Assessment. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/40	61	Question 071 Do you support or object to Policy C11? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC support Policy C11 but would prefer it to be more assertive to reflect the importance of good air quality for health. For example, in points 1 and 2 replace "should" with "must".
2026Reg18/53	8	Question 071 Do you support or object to Policy C11? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Water Services Ltd				Neither	Southern Water is the wastewater service provider for the Swale district and we operate a number of existing wastewater treatment works (WTW) across the district. A number of these WTW are strategic sites that perform an essential function to the district and its neighbours, a function that will at times need to expand in capacity in order to support future growth. We request additional wording in this policy, as locating development adjacent or near to an existing WTW, such as housing, could have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the site's future occupants arising from the WTW's essential operational activities. Such impacts may include odour (as well as noise and vibration). At present nowhere does the local plan sufficiently address the concerns of operators of existing wastewater treatment works in the district - although we note mention of odour in policy GD1(9) and the impact of development on its surroundings in C12, it is this air quality policy C11 that includes the developer responsibility to mitigate impacts on sensitive receptors. Requested wording: We therefore request policy C11 wording be amended to account for the 'agent of change principle' that places responsibilities on the incoming 'agent of change' in relation to odour impacts from existing businesses as below: 4. Proposals which would introduce or intensify sensitive receptors' exposure to poor air quality (including odour) should demonstrate measures that mitigate air quality impacts to ensure the ongoing viability of existing surrounding uses is not compromised. Where this wording cannot be included in policy C11 then we request an additional policy to fully account for the 'agent of change' principle in relation to odour as well as noise and vibration. Further explanation: Paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF December 2024) seeks to ensure that 'existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established', while paragraph 108 states that development should
2026Reg18/76	70	Question 071 Do you support or object to Policy C11? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Opposition Group				Support	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG support Policy C11 but would prefer it to be more assertive to reflect the importance of good air quality for health. For example, in points 1 and 2 replace "should" with "must".

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/40	Gives qualified support for this policy, but comments: Should be more assertive and replace 'should' with 'must'.	Agreed. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/53	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but seeks amendments: Southern Water is the wastewater provider for Swale and may, at times, need to expand in capacity to support future growth. Have concerns about locating new development (eg housing) adjacent or near to existing wastewater treatment works as this could have an unacceptable impact on amenity of the sites future occupants, and suggests wording: 4. Proposals which would introduce or intensify sensitive receptors' exposure to poor air quality (including odour) should demonstrate measures that mitigate air quality impacts to ensure the ongoing viability of existing surrounding uses is not compromised.	Noted. Noted and agreed. Additional wording will be added to policy C12. Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/76	Gives qualified support for this policy, but comments: Should be more assertive and replace 'should' with 'must'.	Agreed. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	29	Question 071 Do you support or object to Policy C11? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.7.8 C11 Air Quality2.7.8.1 Policy criteriaNatural England supports the inclusion of a standalone policy addressing air quality. However, we advise that additional criteria should be added to address impacts to Habitats Sites and SSSIs, and suggest the following wording:"5. Proposals should not significantly delay the date for compliance with environmental thresholds for air pollutants for Habitats Sites or SSSIs that are currently in exceedance of environmental benchmarks (critical levels and loads).6. Proposals emitting air pollutants which impact Habitats Sites must rule out adverse effects on the integrity of such sites. Where this is not possible the derogations route of the Habitats Regulations should be followed.7. To avoid and minimise air pollution impacts any development requiring Habitats Regulations Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) or impacts to SSSIs unrelated to EIA development should consider: a. the measures included which will minimise air pollution impacts on SSSIs and Habitats Sites during the design process of the development; andb. how air quality improvements have informed the design choices made about the location of the development, its layout, and distribution of buildings, on-site activities, amenity spaces and infrastructure." We would also welcome reference to our standing advice for local authorities on air pollution and development, which provides guidance on how to assess planning applications that could affect air quality on a protected site. Our suggested wording is as follows: "8. Consideration will be given to Natural England's standing advice on the impacts of air pollution on protected sites. This advice will be taken into account as a material consideration when making decisions on all relevant planning applications."Further advice on addressing air quality impacts in Local Plans is provided in Annex 5.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Neither supports nor objects to this policy, but comments: Supports inclusion of standalone air quality policy, but advise that additional criteria are added to address impacts on habitats and reference to standing advice on air quality and development, as follows: "5. Proposals should not significantly delay the date for compliance with environmental thresholds for air pollutants for Habitats Sites or SSSIs that are currently in exceedance of environmental benchmarks (critical levels and loads).6. Proposals emitting air pollutants which impact Habitats Sites must rule out adverse effects on the integrity of such sites. Where this is not possible the derogations route of the Habitats Regulations should be followed.7. To avoid and minimise air pollution impacts any development requiring Habitats Regulations Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) or impacts to SSSIs unrelated to EIA development should consider: a. the measures included which will minimise air pollution impacts on SSSIs and Habitats Sites during the design process of the development; andb. how air quality improvements have informed the design choices made about the location of the development, its layout, and distribution of buildings, on-site activities, amenity spaces and infrastructure."" 8. Consideration will be given to Natural England's standing advice on the impacts of air pollution on protected sites. This advice will be taken into account as a material consideration when making decisions on all relevant planning applications."	Noted. Additional criteria agreed. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	96	Question 072 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the direction and overall content of the preamble. It is comprehensive and well referenced to national policy and guidance. However, it could be strengthened by making it more locally grounded, clearer in structure, and more relatable to residents' day-to-day concerns. Below are suggested improvements. 1. Strengthen the Local Context The preamble would benefit from a clearer summary of why pollution and land instability are particularly relevant to Swale, for example: Legacy industrial land in Sittingbourne and Queenborough; Historic landfill and made ground on the Isle of Sheppey and marshland areas; Proximity to internationally designated habitats; Coastal erosion and unstable cliff or marshland environments; Distribution and logistics activity contributing to noise and vibration; Increasing lighting impacts in rural and coastal dark sky areas. A short paragraph explicitly linking national policy to local risks and lived experience would make the policy more relatable. 2. Improve Focus and Readability The preamble is thorough but lengthy. It could be made more focussed by: Grouping sections more clearly under headings (e.g. Hazardous Substances, Land Contamination, Light, Noise, Land Instability); Including short summary statements at the end of each section explaining what		
2026Reg18/131	11	Question 073 Do you support or object to Policy C12? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Environment Agency		.		Neither	Policy C12 – Pollution & land instability We are broadly in agreement with the proposed policy and its approach to the treatment of contaminated land. We support the specific reference to the requirement to protect the groundwater environment within point c and we would ask for this to also be specifically mentioned in the above point b. The policy broadly sets out the stages in which contaminated land should be managed, however, there is no mention of verification of the remedial works. This step is crucial for ensuring that any proposed and agreed remedial works have been undertaken and completed as agreed, or that deviations from agreed works is documented and either approved or rejected (i.e. that further works may still be required to meet remedial objectives). We would ask for an additional point to ensure that verification of remedial works follow once works have been completed.
2026Reg18/40	12	Question 073 Do you support or object to Policy C12? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC support Policy C12. We would like to see an additional policy statement that sets out a requirement for the cumulative effects of new developments and in existing neighbourhoods to achieve a reduction in light pollution of dark skies. Particularly applicable in the Kent Downs National Landscape and its setting.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Supports the preamble. Seeks amendment to add Swale specific context. Seeks amendment to emphasise cumulative and coastal considerations. Seeks amendment to improve structure and clarity. Seeks amendment to highlight the protection of dark landscapes and sensitive habitats. Seeks amendment to reinforce developer responsibilities.	Comment noted. No change proposed. The preamble is just an overview of legislation, national policy and guidance on the matters pertaining to this policy. No change proposed. Cumulative impacts are considered within the preamble and coastal considerations are covered in policy C6. No change proposed. The Council disagrees because sections are headed correctly and the NPPF wording is key to helping understanding national policy and guidance. No change proposed. The Council agrees that more attention can be given to the protection of dark landscapes and sensitive habitats to align with paragraph 189 and 193 of the NPPF. Partial change proposed. Developer responsibilities are set out within the policy. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/131	Broadly agree with the policies approach to contaminated land and seeks amendment to add reference to groundwater environment to point b. The policy does not mention verification of remedial works, seeks amendment for the addition of verification of remedial works following work has been completed.	The Council agrees the groundwater environment can be specifically mentioned in the point b. Change proposed. The Council agrees to add the verification of remedial works post work. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/40	Supports the policy but seeks the amendment to add an policy statement for the cumulative effects of new developments in neighbourhoods and the Kent Downs National Landscapes.	The Council agrees that the Kent Downs National Landscape can be given more consideration. Partial change agrees.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/76	72	Question 073 Do you support or object to Policy C12? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Five Parishes Opposition Group				Support	(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). FPG support Policy C12. We would like to see an additional policy statement that sets out a requirement for the cumulative effects of new developments and in existing neighbourhoods to achieve a reduction in light pollution of dark skies. Particularly applicable in the Kent Downs National Landscape, its setting, the impacts on SPA's, impact on Conservation Areas and their settings.
2026Reg18/108	9	Question 073 Do you support or object to Policy C12? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	Savills	C	Leckie			Owners Land Old Ferry Road, Iwade		Neither	The policy requires applicants to demonstrate that a proposed development is appropriate for its location and that its layout, design and construction will not cause harm to the environment, wildlife, property, or sensitive receptors as a result of hazardous substances, land contamination, noise, vibration or light pollution. The policy should be strengthened by adding wording such as "where adverse effects arise, appropriate mitigation should be secured." This aligns with paragraph 198 of the NPPF, which makes clear that impacts on the natural environment should be mitigated and reduced to a minimum, rather than leading to refusal without considering mitigation. Including this wording ensures the policy is proportionate, deliverable, and focused on preventing adverse effects through mitigation. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/76	Supports the policy but seeks an additional policy on cumulative effects on existing neighbourhoods and in n the Kent Downs National Landscape, its setting, the impacts on SPA's, impact on Conservation Areas and their settings.	The Council agrees to specific attention on National Landscape to align with paragraphs 189 and 193 of the NPPF. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/108	Notes the policy seeks amendment to add "where adverse effects arise, appropriate mitigation should be secured." in line with paragraph 198 of the NPPF.	Comment noted. No change proposed. The Council agrees to add "where adverse effects arise, appropriate mitigation should be secured." to align with NPPF. Change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	31	Question 074 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.8 Biodiversity and Landscapes2.8.1 B1 Biodiversity & geodiversity conservation & BNGNatural England strongly supports the inclusion of this policy.2.8.1.1 PreambleWe are pleased that the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is at the core of the Local Plan strategy (38.0.1). We are pleased that the policy addresses both biodiversity and geodiversity within designated sites, distinguishing between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, and referencing the mitigation hierarchy. We are also pleased that the importance of conserving, enhancing and improving connectivity of biodiversity and habitats outside of designated sites (38.0.22) and on a landscape scale (38.0.25) is included. We refer you to the list of nationally and internationally designated sites provided in paragraph 1.3.1 of this letter to make minor amendments to the designated sites listed in paragraphs 38.0.6-38.0.8 and 38.0.15-38.0.17. We note that Outer Thames Estuary SPA is designated for its populations of breeding common tern and little tern as well as its populations of non-breeding red-throated diver and suggest 38.0.8 is amended to state this. We also advise that it would be useful to include examples of potential indirect impacts on designated sites in the preamble, such as impacts from noise, lighting, recreational disturbance, and loss of functionally linked land.Natural England notes that a strategic policy on Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment and further guidance is anticipated to be set out at the Regulation 19 stage. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this policy and provide advice before the Regulation 19 consultation.We are pleased that the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) has been referenced in this policy's preamble (38.0.33-28.0.34). However, it is currently unclear how it is being considered in the Local Plan. The Strategy should be integrated across the Plan wherever possible, to help inform plan-making more generally, including which sites are proposed for development and environmental improvement. We recognise that the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) has only recently been published (28th November 2025) and that this is an emerging process which will require time to establish and fully		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is at the core of the Local Plan strategy policy addresses both biodiversity and geodiversity within designated sites Useful to include potential indirect impact on designated site in preamble Offer to discuss and advise on strategic policy on Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment and further guidance for Reg 19 pleased that the Kent and Medway Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) has been referenced in this policy's preamble but unclear how it is considered, it should inform the plan generally. Seeks deletion/amendment of this policy/pre-amble as follows: Minor amendments to the designated sites listed in paragraphs 38.0.6-38.0.8 and 38.0.15-38.0.17. Amend for Outer Thames Estuary SPA to include populations of breeding common tern and little tern	Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Seeks deletion/amendment of this policy/pre-amble as follows: Policy reads clearer For completeness Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/62	48	Question 074 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Maidstone Borough Council			The LNRS has now been published and although this is identified at one point, there is a lot of text about what it will be required to or should include, and this might be reviewed now it is in place (38.0.3, 38.0.33), perhaps with reference to the APIB and ACIB layers of the Habitat Map – and suggest also remove the dated information at 38.0.27 and 38.0.28 about BOAs which is now largely superseded with the LNRS. Refer to recent government guidance at 38.0.34. 38.0.40 see also national BNG register – the KCC version has different sites that need to be registered and have legal agreements before they can deliver credits and support new development so these cannot necessarily be relied upon in the planning decision making context. Having reviewed the 'Biodiversity Baseline Study' at 38.0.32, it does not appear to give much clear guidance to developers and some of it is now out of date e.g. reference to an old version of the statutory metric. It also does not directly support a 20% BNG with the only reference to this in the report being to refer to the KNP framework, so suggest this link is removed and current government guidance used instead. Review consistency in uppercase and lowercase for BNG, LWS, RNR etc. Suggest remove the lower case 's' from 'LWSs' and 'RNRs'. Re: 38.0.23, the legislation has been updated with the LURA, particularly in relation to the CROW act. Refer to amendments being made to all of this legislation. The link to the 2005 circular is now also quite dated and would suggest remove (38.0.4). Reconsider 38.0.30 as there seems to be some confusion between the ecological mitigation hierarchy and the BNG hierarchy – statutory credits are the last resort.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/62	Gives qualified support for this preamble for the following reasons: LNRS has now been published, text referencing pre-publication version should be reviewed and with reference APIB ACIB layers of the Habitat Map. Suggest removing BOAs which is now largely superseded which is now superseded with the LNRS. There different sites where legal agreement and registration have to be in place before they can deliver credit and support new development and be relied upon in planning decision making context. Biodiversity baseline study at 38.0.32 does not give clear guidance to developers with some of it out of date Review of lower and uppercase in acronyms Legislation updated LURA is now updated in relation to the CROW act.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted - This will be updated. Noted to be updated Noted to be updated Noted to be updated This will be updated. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	32	Question 075 Do you support or object to Policy B1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	Policy criteria2.8.1.2 Part A – For designated sitesWe welcome the inclusion of policy criteria specific to development proposals impacting designated sites. We welcome the Council's ambition to conserve and enhance designated sites, and support the reference to the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites in accordance with NPPF paragraph 192a. However, we suggest the policy is amended to clarify that the mitigation hierarchy must be followed in accordance with NPPF paragraph 193a.We support criterion 2 for national sites but suggest that it is amended to align more closely with NPPF paragraph 193b. We also suggest that the sites the policy applies to is stated in the criteria. For instance, to clarify if national sites refers to SSSIs, MCZs and/or NNRs, and to clarify that international sites refer to the Habitats Sites listed in NPPF paragraph 194. We advise that any development proposals that would have a direct impact on designated sites should not be selected as appropriate allocation sites in the Regulation 19 stage. We also advise that the policy could be clearer that the criteria apply to all development proposals and is not restricted to site allocations in the Local Plan.We therefore suggest the following amended wording for policy Part A:"Policy B1Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation and biodiversity net gainDevelopment proposals must follow the mitigation hierarchy. Developments must first avoid, then mitigate and only as a last resort compensate for adverse impacts on biodiversity and the natural environment. Part A – For designated sitesDevelopments proposals that have a direct or indirect effect on designated sites, which will be shown on the Proposals Map, which will be available in later stages of the Local Plan, will conserve and enhance them in a manner equal to the significance of their biodiversity and geodiversity status as follows:1. Within internationally designated sites (including candidate sites), the highest level of protection will apply. The Council will ensure that development proposals only proceed when in accordance with relevant Directives, Conventions and Regulations. Where the proposed development, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, is likely to have an

Appen

We are awar

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: welcome the inclusion of policy criteria specific to development proposals impacting designated sites and ambition to conserve and enhance designated sites Sites that have a direct impact on designated sites should not be selected as appropriate allocation sites in the Regulation 19 stage. Can't comment as the strategic policy on Conserving and enhancing the natural environment is not yet provided but should include LNRS and comply with NPPF 192a brownfield sites can be important for wildlife, particularly invertebrate diversity Seeks deletion/amendment of this policy/pre-amble as follows: amended to clarify that the mitigation hierarchy must be followed in accordance with NPPF paragraph 193a. amended that sites the policy applies to is stated in the criteria Further policy A Developments proposals that have a direct or indirect effect on designated sites, which will be shown on the Proposals Map, which will be available in later stages of the Local Plan, will conserve and enhance them in a manner equal to the significance of their biodiversity and geodiversity status as follows A1 - Within internationally designated sites (including candidate sites), the highest level of protection will apply. The Council will ensure that development proposals only proceed when in accordance with relevant Directives, Conventions and Regulations. Within internationally designated sites (including candidate sites), the highest level of protection will apply. The Council will ensure that development proposals only proceed when in accordance with relevant Directives, Conventions and Regulations. Where the proposed development, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects, is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of a Habitats Site (including candidate sites) that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated, the proposed development will have an adverse effects on the integrity of a European site, planning permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances, where there are no less ecologically damaging alternatives, there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest and where compensation for the any loss or damage is secured can be fully compensated;	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: Noted The HELAA assesses the suitability of sites which will be selected based on this. Noted Noted The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Captured already within the preamble This is adequately stated This would be removed in next stage of plan making when map will be available. Partly accepted Partly accepted Already captured Policy wording adequate to provide sufficient flexibility This is treated in other sections of the plan This is treated in other sections of the plan This is treated in other sections of the plan Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/62	49	Question 075 Do you support or object to Policy B1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Maidstone Borough Council				Support	The policy is broadly supported and the requirement for 20% BNG is laudable. However, the draft NPPF reforms make it clear that a 10% BNG requirement should be standard and only allows a higher standard under exceptional circumstances. The feasibility of seeking a higher than 10% BNG target is thus at risk. The rest of the policy text repeats the BNG process and regulations and could therefore be considered unnecessary. Part B lacks reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) which should be the driving biodiversity evidence base and it is required to have regard to the LNRS in planning decisions. The following amendments are proposed: The B1(A) phrasing “where compensation can be sought for any loss or damage” could be strengthened to enable delivery of compensation wherever possible. Refine B1 part B (5) “When significant harm cannot be avoided through consideration of alternative sites or adequate mitigated mitigation provided for on-site or within the immediate locality, compensatory measures will be achieved within the relevant Biodiversity Opportunity Area, or other location as agreed by the Council;” Clarify B1 part B (6) ‘to be set’ – is the reference to ‘strategic policy on Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ part of the LPR or a linked document? Re BNG 2 – this is a part of the national BNG hierarchy and does not need to be duplicated in the Local Plan Review. Re BNG3 – it is reasonable to check the KCC BNG Registry but these sites are not necessarily registered on the national register and the potential credits they may realise may be subject to a significant amount of administration (statutory metric, HMMP, legal s106 or Conservation Covenant agreement) to set them up on the national register to enable them to be used in a development decision making context. There are sites on the national BNG register that are set up for credits that do not appear on the KCC BNG Registry. The LNRS is also directly linked to BNG in that the LNRS provides a 45% uplift in
2026Reg18/74	33	Question 075 Do you support or object to Policy B1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society		Neither	Paras B1, part A, 1-3 are misleading because of the very first word in the paragraph: “within.” In the case of internationally designated sites in particular, the excessive nutrient load being carried into the Swale SPA/Ramsar site from the Faversham WWTW must be recognised for what it is and treated in the same way as in other parts of the country such as nearby Stodmarsh and the Solent. The goal for the Swale must be the same: nutrient neutrality. Failure to do this is having real consequences, with the water of the Swale too turbid for the native oyster bed and seagrass bed restoration initiatives being carried out in less polluted parts of the Thames Estuary. Consequences too in terms of reduced recreational use of coastal waters, bathing, etc. More ambition needed!!The policy should also mention specifically the Kent LNRS completed in 2025 after broad consultation, e.g. in para B3, but implementation should not just be “where appropriate.” It should be required. On BNG: this sounds excellent.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/62	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: 20% BNG is laudable. However, the draft NPPF reforms make it clear that a 10% BNG requirement should be standard and only allows a higher standard under exceptional circumstances. Part B lacks reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) which should be the driving biodiversity evidence base Refine B1 (5) and B1(6), also BNG hierarchy does not need to be duplicated. The LNRS is also directly linked to BNG in that the LNRS provides a 15% uplift in credits within the statutory BNG metric.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: The NPPF is in draft form and can still change hence consideration for it is limited. Unless exempt the council's target is a minimum 20% net gain in biodiversity against a pre-development baseline. Evidence shows that this target compared to 10% has a minimal additional impact upon viability. This will be updated to include reference to LNRS Wording is adequate provides clarity to the policy. Noted Partial Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/74	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons Nutrient load carried into the Swale SPA/Ramser site from Faversham WWTW must be treated the same as in other parts of the country with nutrient neutrality as the goal. Failure on this has consequences on Recreational use of coastal waters and with water of the Swale too turbid for the native oyster bed. Policy should mention the Kent LNRS completed in 2025 Excellent on BNG	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: This is addressed in Policy C10 Water quality and Water Resources This will be addressed and updated at the next stage of plan making Noted Change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	33	Question 076 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Natural England	Natural	England	2.8.2 B2 Conserving & enhancing valued landscapes2.8.2.1 PreambleNatural England supports this policy which distinguishes between the hierarchy of national and local landscape designations and provides a policy to protect, enhance and manage valued landscapes. We are pleased that a range of supporting evidence has been included in the preamble, such as the Swale Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2019), and particularly welcome the information provided about National Character Areas (NCAs).We note that information on the Kent Downs National Landscape is provided in the preamble of this policy (paragraphs 39.0.15-39.0.24). We are pleased that this information has been provided, but we advise that it would be more suitable for the preamble for policy B3 which specifically relates to development impacting the Kent Downs National Landscape.We welcome paragraph 39.0.18 which states that the Council will refuse proposals for major development within the National Landscape unless in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest and based on an assessment in accordance with NPPF paragraph 190. However, we note that the council has not provided a definition of 'major development' (paragraph 39.0.19). Natural England strongly encourages your authority to provide a definition of what constitutes 'major development' to enable informed decisions to be made regarding development proposals within the Kent Downs National Landscape.We welcome paragraph 39.0.20 which references the Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan 2021-2026 regarding National Landscape settings. We advise that the scale and extent of development within the National Landscapes should be limited. We note that policy criteria for development in the settings of designated landscapes has been included in Part C, but this only applies to the setting of Areas of High Landscape Value. We therefore recommend that information about the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape is moved to Policy B3.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: distinguishes between the hierarchy of national and local landscape designations and provides a policy to protect, enhance and manage valued landscapes. Pleased with supporting evidence note that information on the Kent Downs National Landscape is provided in the preamble but better at Policy B3 welcome that the Council will refuse proposals for major development within the National Landscape unless in exceptional circumstances but no definition for major development. Advise that the scale and extent of development within the National Landscapes should be limited. Note that policy criteria for development in the settings of designated landscapes has been included in Part C, setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape is moved to Policy B3.	The Council (partially) disagrees for the following reasons: Noted Noted Kent Downs National Landscape preamble moved to Policy B3 and deleted in preamble of Policy B2: National landscapes - the Kent Downs National Landscape 39.0.15In 1968 a large part of the North Downs within the borough was designated as part of the Kent Downs National Landscape. The aim of this national designation was to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape. The aim of the Kent Downs National LandscapeManagement Plan (290)adopted in November 2021is to secure conservation and enhancement within the National Landscape while supporting local communities. The plan is adopted by the relevant Kent Districts and London boroughs as a material consideration in planning applications withsimilar weight to a Supplementary Planning Document. 39.0.16Accompanying the National Landscapemanagement plan are a number of supportingguidance documents(291)which should be taken into account in relevant cases. These include the National Landscape's: Guidance on the selection of and use of colour in development; Farm Diversification Toolkit; Kent Downs Farmsteads Guidance; Managing Land for Horses; Rural Streets and Lanes - A Design Handbook; Position Statement on Renewable Energy and its Companion Report as well as the Landscape DesignHandbook. The National Landscape Unit also publish guidance on specific aspects of land management, for example, chalk grassland, orchard, woodland and hedgerow management. 39.0.17The landscape of the Kent Downs is made up of 13 character areas. The character area of most relevance to Swale is the Mid Kent Downs. Key characteristics and objectives for the Mid Kent Downs have been defined by the AONB Unit and should be reflected in relevant planning applications. 39.0.18In accordance with the NPPF(292)the Council will refuse proposals for major development within the National Landscape unless in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest and based on an assessment of: the need for the development, including national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, on the local economy; the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. 39.0.19In terms of what may constitute 'major development' for the purposes of this Local Plan, it will be a matter of judgement.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/31	53	Question 076 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent	The preamble to the policy should make clear that the Kent Downs National Landscape is a valued landscape and/or reference made to the following policy (B3). The plan should recognise that Swale has special circumstances whereby not only the Kent Downs National Landscape should be protected, but also other areas adjoining the national landscape which are of an exceptional quality in terms of landscaping. Development on these areas should only be a last resort. Paragraph 39.0.2 makes reference to National Parks. As there are no National Parks within Swale reference to them is confusing and should be deleted. While we welcome the reference to tranquillity (and dark skies), we would however again request that a standalone policy be drafted to specifically address dark skies in accordance with CPRE's national campaign. For example, this policy wording (policy ENV4) is included in the Ashford local plan: Proposals will be permitted provided that the lighting proposed is: the minimum appropriate for its purpose; is designed such that lighting is directed downwards, with a beam angle below 70 degrees and; that no significant adverse effects individually or cumulatively will result to the character of the area, the residential amenity of local residents, the safety of vehicle users and pedestrians or the diurnal/seasonal rhythms of the Borough's biodiversity assets. The correlated colour temperature (CCT) of outdoor lighting should not exceed 3000 Kelvins in order to limit the effects of known environmental hazards associated with short-wavelength visible light. Proposals where external lighting is required should include a full lighting scheme that provides information about layout and beam orientation, a schedule of the light equipment proposed including luminaire type, mounting height, aiming angles and lumen unit levels. Schemes will be expected to comply with ILP technical guidance in relation to the Environmental Zone in which an application is proposed. Within the area proposed to be designated as a 'dark sky zone', proposals will		
2026Reg18/46	8	Question 076 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Kent Downs National Landscap e	Catherine	Hughes	(See attached letter) There are a number of concerning inaccuracies in the supporting text to this policy. Most significantly, paragraph 39.0.5 is not correct. Section 85 of the CRoW Act was amended in 2023 to create a new duty on relevant authorities that they "must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area" when discharging their functions (including plan-making) in National Landscapes. The new duty replaces the previous requirement for relevant authorities to 'have regard' to the purpose of AONBs and the government is clear that it is intended as a more proactive and strengthened requirement. Guidance for relevant authorities in how to comply with this new strengthened Protected Landscapes duty was produced by Defra in 2024. The Kent Downs National Landscape team has also produced two advice notes on the duty, one specifically for local planning authorities and one providing more general advice for all relevant authorities, which can be found on our website. We are happy to work with the Council to revise the supporting text here if that would be helpful.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/31	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: make clear that the Kent Downs National Landscape is a valued landscape Swale has special circumstances whereby Kent Downs National Landscape and also other areas adjoining the national landscape should be protected and development there should be last resort Reference to national parks removed Tranquility and dark skies should have its own policy Lyn valley should be given protection	Status established in the plan Impact by development on Adjoining areas within the setting are required to be considered and addressed Noted - reference to National park will be removed Tranquility is sufficiently covered in the plan as it concerns the Borough. Dry valleys in proximity are usually included within the setting of the National Landscape Partial changes Proposed
2026Reg18/46	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: new duty on relevant authorities that they "must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area" when discharging their functions (including plan-making) in National Landscapes	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: text will be amended to incorporate the new duty on the council Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/46	9	Question 077 Do you support or object to Policy B2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Kent Downs National Landscape	Catherine	Hughes		Neither	(See attached letter) There is no reference to the Kent Downs National Landscape in Policy B2 despite extensive background information on this designated landscape being included in the supporting text. This presents a rather muddled policy approach to these important Local Plan issues. Given that the following Policy (B3) addresses minor development in or affecting the National Landscape we suggest these two policies are re-examined and rewritten during the preparation of the Regulation 19 Draft, to deliver a clearer Local Plan policy approach to development in or affecting the National Landscape.
2026Reg18/62	50	Question 077 Do you support or object to Policy B2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Maidstone Borough Council				Neither	The following amendments are suggested: B2 is supported and the initial phrasing 'The value, character, amenity and tranquility of the borough's landscapes will be protected, enhanced and managed' is likely to add weight to decision-making and at planning appeal. However, SBC may want to review their LCA to ensure that 'value' is clearly defined for each character area. Could reference GLVIA3 at some point as particularly relevant guidance to this policy that will be complied with. B2 Part A (1) The use of 'significant' at 'The scale, layout, build and landscape design of development that will have significant impact...' may be difficult to quantify in practice and may risk difficulties defending upon appeal. B2 Part A (3) A really useful policy as cumulative impacts can sometimes be minimised in decision making and at appeal. The recognised LVIA abbreviation might be added to the text. B2 Part B (1a) Supported. Recognises the importance of both the quality and clarity of the Statements of Significance – suggest landscape positive landscape attributes and features are made clear in these Statements and detracting features are made just as clear and accessible. Part B (1c) "avoidance, minimisation, mitigating and compensating adverse landscape impacts as appropriate..." substantially weakens the policy. Minimisation of impacts as appropriate may result in inadequate mitigation and harmful development in the countryside. Part C (1) Suggest removal of the text 'where relevant' as it is unclear under what circumstances of the impact on the setting of Areas of High Landscape Vale would not be fully assessed?
2026Reg18/16	27	Question 078 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	§ 40.0.1 'In addition, the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000, seeks to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape.' This is not quite right. Section 85 of the CROW Act requires public bodies to 'have regard' to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Section 245 of the 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.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/46	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: KDNL background and policy is muddled between B2 and B3	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted, this has been picked up and will be amended for in the Reg 19 Version Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/62	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: SBC may want to review their LCA to ensure that 'value' is clearly defined for each character area. Could reference GLVIA3 Really useful policy, the recognised LVIA abbreviation might be added to the text. Supported - it recognises the importance of both the quality and clarity of the Statements of Significance Minimisation of impacts as appropriate may result in inadequate mitigation and harmful development in the countryside.	The council partially agrees. Noted This will be considered for inclusion as part of the preamble Noted Noted Noted Partial change proposed
2026Reg18/16	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: 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.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Updates new duties on the council. Change already proposed based on previous reps Partial Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/31	22	Question 078 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent	Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act has amended the Countryside and Rights of Way Act to place greater emphasis on the protection of national landscapes. This provision requires public bodies to “seek to further” the statutory purposes of national landscapes, including the purpose to conserve and enhance wildlife in protected landscapes, and replaces a previous weaker duty to “have regard” to the purposes. We welcome the reference to the CROW Act at paragraph 40.01 The plan should recognise that Swale has special circumstances whereby not only the Kent Downs National Landscape should be protected, but also other areas adjoining the national landscape which are of an exceptional quality in terms of landscaping. Development on these areas should be only as a last resort. The policy and preamble should be amended to ensure that views into and out of the designated national landscape are protected, as well as its setting. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (and cross-reference made to policy C5). We understand that the Kent Downs National Landscape unit is currently updating its 2011 Renewable Energy Statement. Pending its publication your attention is drawn to the position statement of the High Weald National Landscape unit (2025). Namely that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. We note that reference to valued landscapes has been removed from the consultation draft of the 2025 NPPF. As such, this draft local plan policy will take on extra significance in terms of future development management decisions. We query whether the wording is sufficiently strong to secure its intended aims. Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?		
2026Reg18/46	10	Question 078 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Kent Downs National Landscape	Catherine	Hughes	(See attached letter) As stated in our response to Policy B2 we are of the view that this part of the Plan is rather muddled. The preamble to Policy B3 is very brief and at paragraph 40.0.1 again cites an out-of-date reference to the legal duty on the Council. Much of the supporting text to this Policy has been placed against Policy B2. We feel a complete refresh would therefore be appropriate and are happy to provide informal comments on re-drafts if the Council would find this helpful.		
2026Reg18/74	34	Question 078 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	The preamble should mention that, since December 2023, public bodies must give nature recovery a higher priority than they have done previously. Managers should therefore be integrating nature recovery into the core of their operations and aiming to be exemplars of sustainable land management. It would also be useful to mention the LNRS in that respect as a common framework both for the National Landscape and for SBC.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/31	Gives qualified support for this preamble for the following reasons: Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act has amended the Countryside and Rights of Way Act with a requirement for public bodies to "seek to further" greater emphasis now placed on the protection of national landscapes. Kent Downs National Landscape should be protected, but also other areas adjoining the national landscape which are of an exceptional quality in terms of landscaping. Ensures views into and out of the designated national landscape are protected, as well as its setting. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy Attention is drawn to High Weald National Landscape unit (2025) that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Query whether the wording is sufficiently strong to secure its intended aims in light of reference to valued landscapes being removed from the consultation draft of the 2025 NPPF.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Change proposed Noted This is considered as part of the character of the landscape. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy Noted The wording is sufficient. Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/46	Gives qualified support for this policy/pre-amble for the following reasons: KDNL background and policy is muddled between B2 and B3	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Noted, this has been picked up and will be amended for in the Reg 19 Version Change Proposed.
2026Reg18/74	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: Policy should mention that public bodies must give nature recovery a higher priority than they have done previously and mention also LNRS as a framework for National Landscape and SBC.	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Provides more up to date information. Partial change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/127	34	Question 079 Do you support or object to Policy B3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.8.3 B3 Kent Downs National Landscape Management PlanNatural England strongly supports the inclusion of this policy which seeks to enhance the natural beauty and special character of the Kent Downs National Landscape.As this policy sets criteria for development proposals to be compared to, rather than being specifically related to the Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan, we advise that an amended title of “B3 Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan” would be more appropriate. 2.8.3.2 Policy criteriaWhilst we support the requirement that “Major development within the National Landscape area will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest”, in line with NPPF paragraph 190, we note that a definition of major development has not been provided in the Draft Plan. To align with NPPF requirements, we recommend that a definition of “major” development is provided, either within the policy or supporting text, in line with footnote 67 of the NPPF. This will help to strengthen the policy and enable informed decisions to be made regarding development proposals within the Kent Downs National Landscape. Without this definition, it is currently difficult to provide comprehensive comments on the policy requirements for major and minor developments.We support criteria 1, 2 and 3 of this policy, but advise that these should apply to all developments within the National Landscape and its setting. We suggest that the policy should be strengthened by adding additional wording to ensure the policy aligns with both the requirements of the NPPF and the LURA duty to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that development within a National Landscape setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. We therefore advise that any development proposals within the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape should give consideration to the level of landscape sensitivity, risk of potential impacts on special qualities and views, and the scope for mitigation to ensure they are sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise any adverse impacts. We advise that for

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/127	Gives qualified support for this policy for the following reasons: Supports the inclusion of policy which seeks to enhance the beauty and special character of Ken Downs National Landscape Definition for major development not provided so can't provide comprehensive comment Support policy Criteria 1, 2 and 3 but it should apply to all developments Strengthen to ensure it aligns with LURA to duty to "seek to further" the purpose of... 5. Seeks amendment of this policy as follows: "Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan Within the National Landscape area, the goal of the plan is to ensure the natural beauty and special character of the landscape and vitality of the communities are recognised, valued, enhanced and strengthened well beyond the plan period. Major development within the National Landscape area will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment as set out in the NPPF, that considers applications for development in these areas.Minor d Development within the National Landscape and its setting will be permitted provided that:1. The location, form, scale, materials and design will conserve or enhance the character of the landscape and rural settlements;2. The development would conserve or enhance the special qualities and condition of the distinctive landscape character and including tranquillity of the National Landscape;3. The development supports the adopted National Landscape Management Plan and any associated guidance; and4. Unless allocated by the Local Plan Review, should avoid the loss of high-quality agricultural land.5. Development within the National Landscape setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the National Landscape.6. Developments which may impact the National Landscape will be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) at the planning application stage and have regard to the Kent Downs National Landscape Management Plan and supporting documents and guidance."	Noted Definition for major development not provided so can't provide comprehensive comment Noted Noted - policy will be amended to reflect this. Policy wording is adequate and adding to it will lead to unnecessary repetition. Partial change proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/31	44	Question 079 Do you support or object to Policy B3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				CPRE Kent	CPRE	Kent		Neither	Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act has amended the Countryside and Rights of Way Act to place greater emphasis on the protection of national landscapes. This provision requires public bodies to “seek to further” the statutory purposes of national landscapes, including the purpose to conserve and enhance wildlife in protected landscapes, and replaces a previous weaker duty to “have regard” to the purposes. We welcome the reference to the CROW Act at paragraph 40.01 The plan should recognise that Swale has special circumstances whereby not only the Kent Downs National Landscape should be protected, but also other areas adjoining the national landscape which are of an exceptional quality in terms of landscaping. Development on these areas should be only as a last resort. The policy and preamble should be amended to ensure that views into and out of the designated national landscape are protected, as well as its setting. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy on land designated as being a national landscape (and cross-reference made to policy C5). We understand that the Kent Downs National Landscape unit is currently updating its 2011 Renewable Energy Statement. Pending its publication your attention is drawn to the position statement of the High Weald National Landscape unit (2025). Namely that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Greater commitment should be given to roof top solar ahead of the change in Building Regulations. We note that reference to valued landscapes has been removed from the consultation draft of the 2025 NPPF. As such, this draft local plan policy will take on extra significance in terms of future development management decisions. We query whether the wording is sufficiently strong to secure its intended aims. Has the corresponding policy in the 2017 adopted Local Plan successfully achieved its envisaged aims?
2026Reg18/40	64	Question 079 Do you support or object to Policy B3? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson		Support	BPC supports Policy B3. We would prefer the second sentence to read'Major Development within the National Landscape will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is critical to the public interest.'On Minor development, the 'setting' should be included in 2 (.....'tranquillity of the National Landscape and its setting').
2026Reg18/74	37	Question 081 Do you support or object to Policy B4? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society		Neither	As it stands, the final sentence of the policy makes nonsense of the entire concept of maintaining gaps between settlements. It should read: “Within these gaps planning permission will not be granted for development that would undermine one or more of their purposes.”

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/31	Gives qualified support for this preamble for the following reasons: Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act has amended the Countryside and Rights of Way Act with a requirement for public bodies to "seek to further" greater emphasis now placed on the protection of national landscapes. Kent Downs National Landscape should be protected, but also other areas adjoining the national landscape which are of an exceptional quality in terms of landscaping. Ensure views into and out of the designated national landscape are protected, as well as its setting. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy Attention is drawn to High Weald National Landscape unit (2025) that, ground mounted solar farms within the national landscape should not be considered acceptable. Query whether the wording is sufficiently strong to secure its intended aims in light of reference to valued landscapes being removed from the consultation draft of the 2025 NPPF.	The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: Change proposed Noted This is considered as part of the character of the landscape. Reference should be made to the impact of renewable energy Noted The wording is sufficient. Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/40	Seeks deletion/amendment of this policy as follows: 'Major Development within the National Landscape will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in critical to the public interest.' tranquillity of the National Landscape and its setting	The Council (partially) disagrees for the following reasons: 1. Original text is clear on the intention of the policy. The Council (partially) agrees for the following reasons: 2. Closes a vacuum and provides clarity on how policy is applied in National Landscape setting. Partial Change Proposed
2026Reg18/74	That the reference to allocated sites in the gaps s removed from the last sentence in the Policy	The Council agrees for the following reasons: Whilst a suite of sites for development have not been consulted upon the HELAA findings 2025 has identified a wide range of potentially suitable sites across the borough that are both outside Important Local Countryside Gaps. Delete the words unless allocated for development by the Local Plan Change Proposed

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/40	65	Question 082 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Bredgar Parish Council	Teresa	Hudson	Paragraph 42.0.4 – typos – line 3, replace ‘help’ with ‘will help to’. Also the letter ‘s’ is missing in several places. Paragraph 42.0.5 – could orchards be added to the list?		
2026Reg18/76	81	Question 082 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). Paragraph 42.0.4 – typos – line 3, replace ‘help’ with ‘will help to’. Also the letter ‘s’ is missing in several places. Paragraph 42.0.5 – could orchards be added to the list?		
2026Reg18/62	53	Question 083 Do you support or object to Policy B5? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Maidstone Borough Council				Neither	The following amendments are suggested: B5 (1c) – remove ‘preferably’ from ‘preferably native’. B5 (1i) – refer to the 15m buffer requirement at 42.0.8 if this requirement is to be delivered. B5 2 – inclusion of the requirement for Arboricultural Surveys to be to the British Standard (A British Standard compliant (BS5837) tree survey will comprise an assessment of the condition and quality of trees on the site and will include scope, survey method, details of proposed works, tree protection measures, root protection areas/zones, a hazard assessment and details of any necessary identified tree works).
2026Reg18/127	40	Question 091 Do you support or object to Policy B9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Natural England	Natural	England		Neither	2.8.8 B9 The keeping & grazing of horses 2.8.8.1 Policy criteria Natural England supports this policy. We advise that the Draft Plan has overarching policies to consider developments against regarding impacts to landscapes and the environment. We refer you to our overarching comments in paragraph 2.1. It would be Natural England’s preference to rely on strong overarching policies in the Draft Plan. We advise that a link could be made to relevant overarching policies such as Policies B1, B2 and B3, and any others the Council deems relevant. We would suggest the following wording, and advise that this should be included in all other relevant policies for consistency:“Planning permission will only be granted for development involving the use of land for the keeping or grazing of horses and ponies in connection with riding or other non-agricultural purposes, if they are of high quality design and of a scale and intensity that is acceptable in landscape character biodiversity, amenity and highway terms, in accordance with Policy B1, B2 and B3.”

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/40	1. This is a duplicate representation	1. This changes proposed in the response were agreed against the duplicate response. Change proposed
2026Reg18/76	1. Seeks amendment of the preamble as follow paragraph 42.0.4 - line 3, replace 'help' with 'will help to' 2. Comments that letter S is missing in several places 3. Seeks amendment of the preamble as follows Paragraph 42.0.5 - could orchards be added to the list	1. The Council agrees for the following reasons replacing Paragraph 42.0.4 line 3, 'help' with 'will help to' would make the preamble clearer to read 2. Comment that the preamble will be subjected to further checks 3. The Council agrees for the following reasons that adding the word orchards at Paragraph 42.0.5 would provide the correct detail for the Policy matters Change proposed
2026Reg18/62	1. Seeks amendment to Policy criteria 1c to remove 'preferably' from 'preferably native'. 2. Seeks amendment to Policy criteria 1i to refer to the 15m buffer requirement 3. Seeks amendment to Policy criteria 2 inclusion of the requirement for Arboricultural Surveys to be to the British Standard (A British Standard compliant (BS5837)	1. The Council disagrees for the following reasons The term preferably is considered appropriate as it may allow for alternative species if there is need for deviation. 2. The Council disagrees for the following reasons the 15m buffer matter is set out in the preamble and the approach is set out in national guidance. 3.The Council partially agrees for the following reasons: The Policy criteria would benefit from setting out type of survey standard is required criteria worded to "2. Major development schemes shall submit an Arboriculture Survey that is BS5837 compliant Proposed change
2026Reg18/127	1. Supports this policy but seeks the inclusion of the following text; "Planning permission will only be granted for development involving the use of land for the keeping or grazing of horses and ponies in connection with riding or other non-agricultural purposes, if they are of high quality design and of a scale and intensity that is acceptable in landscape character biodiversity, amenity and highway terms, in accordance with Policy B1, B2 and B3." 2. It is Natural England's preference to rely on strong overarching policies within the plan.	1. The Council will consider the inclusion of referencing Policy B1, B2 and B3 within the Keeping and Grazing of Horses B9 policy. (Planning permission will only be granted for development involving the use of land for the keeping or grazing of horses and ponies in connection with riding or other non-agricultural purposes, if they are of high quality design and of a scale and intensity that is acceptable in landscape character biodiversity, amenity and highway terms, in accordance with Policy B1, B2 and B3.) 2. Noted. Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/53	10	Question 091 Do you support or object to Policy B9? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				Southern Water Services Ltd				Neither	Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for the Swale district. We request additional wording for policy B9 to help protect the quality of the water environment. Requested changes: The scale of the facility should be no more than is reasonably required for the proper functioning of the enterprise or the use of the land to which it is associated compatible with the surrounding landscape character, features, biodiversity and type/location of any sensitive groundwater zones (source protection zones in particular). Further explanation and evidence Source Protection Zones (SPZ) are created by the Environment Agency for licensed groundwater abstractions and warrant additional protection as they provide public drinking water supply. It is important to keep drinking water standards in mind when protecting SPZ. These are more stringent than the environmental standards more often referred to in guidance for the protection of groundwater. The principal rule of groundwater protection is preventing or avoiding potentially contaminating activities from occurring in the first place within groundwater catchments used for drinking water. Although groundwater is treated before feeding into supply, planned treatment processes cannot react to every change in water quality. Were an SPZ to become contaminated, this could result in loss of public water supply. It is therefore critical to protect water quality in source protection zonesto the impacts of all types of development. As stated in Environment Agency guidance here - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/drinking-water-protected-areas-challenges-for-the-water-environment There is a long way to go in terms of land use planning in order to have sustainable and unpolluted water supplies. In the event of current mechanisms and measures not improving the water quality, the Secretary of State for the Environment can designate a water protection zone if shown to be appropriate.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/53	1. Seeks addition to this policy to include; "The scale of the facility should be no more than is reasonably required for the proper functioning of the enterprise or the use of the land to which it is associated compatible with the surrounding landscape character, features, biodiversity and type/location of any sensitive groundwater zones (source protection zones in particular)."	1. The Council will investigate the inclusion of part of the suggested text to include any sensitive groundwater zones. (..... that is acceptable in landscape character, biodiversity, type/locations of any sensitive groundwater zones (source protection zones in particular), amenity and highway terms. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/22	18	Question 092 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?	Finn's	Mollie	Lay	Finn's			'Listed buildings make up less than 1% of the borough's stock of buildings, and as such, it is expected that the focus on combating climate change will first and foremost be on that vast majority of buildings that can be adapted to help combat climate change, with little or no harm to their intrinsic character and associated appearance.' This assumes that those who wish to improve the efficiency of Listed Buildings would not be allowed. This may not be the case and would be subject of a listed building application on a case by case basis.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/22	'Listed buildings make up less than 1% of the borough's stock of buildings, and as such, it is expected that the focus on combating climate change will first and foremost be on that vast majority of buildings that can be adapted to help combat climate change, with little or no harm to their intrinsic character and associated appearance.'assumes that those who wish to improve the efficiency of Listed Buildings would not be allowed. This may not be the case and would be subject of a listed building application on a case by case basis.	The Council partially agrees and considers that the drafting could be refined to make the emphasis clearer, more relevant, and better aligned with the intended objectives. Climate change 47.0.8 Proposals that aim to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change should in the first instance explore all opportunities of enhancing energy efficiency and forms of providing renewable energy and improved adaptation to climate change without harming the significance of heritage assets. 47.0.9 Where conflict between climate change objectives and the conservation of heritage assets is unavoidable, the public benefit of mitigating the effects of climate change will be weighed against any harm to the significance of heritage assets, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 367 (NPPF) and the development management policies and principles of this Local Plan. The more significant the heritage asset, the greater the degree of public benefit that will need to be demonstrably achievable to justify even a low level of harm to the heritage asset. Heritage assets are finite resources and with their embedded energy and in many cases, adaptability to re-use over a long period of time, they are in many cases already inherently sustainable. As such, there will be instances where proposed alteration in a particular way to help combat climate change will be firmly resisted to ensure that the significance of the heritage asset isn't compromised to an unacceptable degree. Listed buildings make up less than 1% of the borough's stock of buildings, and as such, it is expected that the focus on combating climate change will first and foremost be on that vast majority of buildings that can be adapted to help combat climate change, with little or no harm to their intrinsic character and associated appearance. Climate change 47.0.8 The borough's historic buildings are inherently sustainable. They are durable, adaptable, and constructed using materials that can be repaired and maintained, allowing their lifespan to be extended indefinitely. They also embody a significant amount of carbon from their original construction. However, as these buildings evolve, they must remain suitable for the people who live in, use, and care for them, while also contributing to a greener, more sustainable future. The Council therefore supports thoughtful and sensitive measures that both preserve heritage significance and address climate change by reducing energy demand, strengthening resilience, and mitigating climate impacts. There are many ways to improve the energy efficiency and climate resilience of historic or traditional buildings. However, the need and opportunity to do so will vary depending on the building's context. A whole-building approach is therefore recommended when considering adaptations. This approach assesses the building in its entirety to identify effective solutions that reduce energy use and

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	39	Question 092 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the preamble and supports the strong emphasis on protecting and enhancing listed buildings as irreplaceable heritage assets. General Comments The preamble clearly sets out: The statutory protection afforded to listed buildings; The importance of heritage statements and proper justification; The need for high-quality design and craftsmanship; The careful balancing of climate change objectives with heritage conservation. This is appropriate and consistent with national policy and legislation. Suggestions to Strengthen and Clarify 1. Greater Local Context The preamble could be strengthened by briefly acknowledging: The importance of Swale's historic rural villages, farmsteads and maritime heritage; The contribution listed buildings make to local identity, tourism and sense of place; The role of historic buildings in maintaining village character and tranquillity. Making the policy more locally relatable would reinforce its relevance to communities. 2. Setting and Incremental Harm It would be helpful to emphasise:		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Agrees with the preamble. Seeks amendment to preamble by acknowledging the importance of the Swale's rural villages, farmsteads and maritime heritage, the contribution listed buildings make to local identity, tourism and sense of place and the role of historic buildings in maintaining village character and tranquillity. Seeks amendment so the preamble emphasises the cumulative impact of small-scale changes to curtilage, boundaries, parking and hardstanding, the importance of traditional materials and boundary treatments and the need to protect historic gardens, orchards and associated landscape features. Seeks amendment to preamble to encourage early engagement with conservation officers when considering energy efficiency measures, promote sensitive retrofit approaches and Recognise the sustainability value of repair and reuse over demolition and replacement.	Comment noted. Comment noted although it is not necessary to amend the preamble as it refers to Listed buildings are irreplaceable heritage assets and the policy references specific contributors to significance including materials and setting. The Council partially agrees and considers that the drafting could be refined to make the sustainability emphasis clearer, more relevant, and better aligned with the intended objectives. See 47.0.3 and 47.0.8. 1. No Change Proposed. 2. No Change Proposed. 3. Partial Change Proposed; 47.0.3 - There is a presumption in favour of preserving listed buildings, and consent will only be given in very exceptional circumstances for their demolition. Poor condition is no justification for demolition, and where a building is redundant, every effort must be made to find a viable new use, which should be consistent with the character, appearance, and fabric of the building. The Council will use its statutory powers to ensure that listed buildings at risk from neglect or decay are appropriately maintained and repaired. 47.0.8 The borough's historic buildings are inherently sustainable. They are durable, adaptable, and constructed using materials that can be repaired and maintained, allowing their lifespan to be extended indefinitely. They also embody a significant amount of carbon from their original construction. However, as these buildings evolve, they must remain suitable for the people who live in, use, and care for them, while also contributing to a greener, more sustainable future. The Council therefore supports thoughtful and sensitive measures that both preserve heritage significance and address climate change by reducing energy demand, strengthening resilience, and mitigating climate impacts. There are many ways to improve the energy efficiency and climate resilience of historic or traditional buildings. However, the need and opportunity to do so will vary depending on the building's context. A whole-building approach is therefore recommended when considering adaptations. This approach assesses the building in its entirety to identify effective solutions that reduce energy use and carbon emissions, sustain heritage significance, and provide a safe and comfortable indoor environment. Further guidance is provided in Historic England Advice Note 18: Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency. Where proposed works would affect the significance of a heritage asset, a Heritage Statement should be submitted to explain the impact. The benefits of climate sensitive measures will be carefully weighed against any harm to heritage significance, in

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/74	43	Question 092 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	Para 47.0.3This commitment to the use of statutory powers is too weak. The Faversham Society realises that the financial unknowns and risks to any Local Authority make them reluctant to exercise their statutory powers but there are too many listed buildings, frequently on long leases, which are not being appropriately maintained. We would request Swale to create and regularly publish their own list of listed buildings at risk in order to reduce neglect and encourage appropriate maintenance and repair. Para. 47.0.05This paragraph discusses potential harm posed by a proposal to the significance of a listed building and refers to the need for convincing justification. The Faversham Society is concerned by the poor quality of some of the listed building consent applications it has reviewed in the past. It is not sufficient in report assessments simply to quote the Statutory Listing description and the Society asks that the text of the penultimate sentence in paragraph 47.0.05 be amended to read “.....its significance will not be permitted unless there is a clear and convincing justification submitted in writing as part of the initial statutory application.” Para. 47.0.05 & 47.0.07Proposals for alteration, change of use or demolition of listed buildings frequently follow periods of neglect of those buildings: sometimes that neglect is deliberate. While the Faversham Society realises that ‘condition’ is not, in Planning terms, a legitimate justification for alteration, change of use or demolition, in reality it is extremely difficult for Planning officers not to take account of poor condition. We would ask Swale to add a sentence in one of these paragraphs to the effect that where an application is made for the alteration, change of use or demolition of a listed building that is in poor condition, the accompanying heritage statement should include an explanation of the reason for that poor condition.		
2026Reg18/82	27	Question 092 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?					SARAH	MOAKES	It should be noted that the draftNPPF proposes significant changes that would offer increased protection for nondesignated heritage assets. The policy shifts from a general ‘balanced judgement’ to a requirement that any harm tothese locally listed buildings must be actively outweighed by the benefits of a proposal. A heritage impactassessment will also be required.Both these heritage policies are very poorly worded. Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (ListedBuildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 amount to a statutory presumption against developmentthat would harm the significance of a listed building or a conservation area a sense which is completely lost here. Answer duplicated at question 93		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/74	Regarding paragraph 47.0.3 the current commitment to using statutory powers is insufficient. The financial risks make local authorities hesitant, but stresses that many listed buildings often on long leases are still poorly maintained. Seeks that Swale Council create and regularly publish a building at risk list to discourage neglect and promote proper upkeep. Regarding paragraph 47.0.5 there are concerns about proposals that may harm listed buildings and the need for strong justification. Criticizes the poor quality of some past consent applications and says simply citing the statutory listing is inadequate. Seeks amendment to the wording so it reads "its significance will not be permitted unless there is a clear and convincing justification submitted in writing as part of the initial statutory application." Regarding paragraph 47.0.05 & 47.0.07, proposals to alter, change the use of, or demolish listed buildings often come after periods of neglect, which may sometimes be intentional. While acknowledging that a building's condition is not officially a valid planning justification, it notes that poor condition inevitably influences decisions. The Faversham Society recommends adding a requirement that, when such applications involve buildings in poor condition, the heritage statement must explain why the building has deteriorated.	Comment noted. Historic England manages a Heritage at Risk register that is updated annually providing a dynamic picture of the sites most at risk and most in need of safeguarding for the future. The Council disagrees as the test here aligns with the NPPF. Partially agreed and a change to paragraph 47.0.3 is proposed. 1. No Change Proposed. 2. No Change Proposed. 3. Partial Change Proposed; 47.0.3 - There is a presumption in favour of preserving listed buildings, and consent will only be given in very exceptional circumstances for their demolition. Poor condition is no justification for demolition, and where a building is redundant, every effort must be made to find a viable new use, which should be consistent with the character, appearance, and fabric of the building. The Council will use its statutory powers to ensure that listed buildings at risk from neglect or decay are appropriately maintained and repaired.
2026Reg18/82	Notes that the draft NPPF proposes changes that would offer increase protection for non-designated heritage assets. Shifts from a balanced judgment to a any harm tothese locally listed buildings must be actively outweighed by the benefits of a proposal. A heritage impact assessment will also be required. Both these heritage policies are very poorly worded. Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 amount to a statutory presumption against development that would harm the significance of a listed building or a conservation area a sense which is completely lost here.	Noted, the NPPF is currently in draft form and remains subject to change. The supporting text and policy wording will be reviewed and updated, where necessary, to reflect any changes in a future iteration of the Local Plan. Also, non-designated assets are considered under separate LP policy. Noted, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the "Act") imposes a mandatory statutory duty to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving" heritage assets. The NPPF provides the policy tests. Agreed and change proposed that the presumption in favour of preserving listed buildings should be included; 47.0.3 - There is a presumption in favour of preserving listed buildings, and consent will only be given in very exceptional circumstances for their demolition. Poor condition is no justification for demolition, and where a building is redundant, every effort must be made to find a viable new use, which should be consistent with the character, appearance, and fabric of the building. The Council will use its statutory powers to ensure that listed buildings at risk from neglect or decay are appropriately maintained and repaired. 1. No Change Proposed. 2. Partial Change Proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/120	24	Question 093 Do you support or object to Policy HE1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	L	Sinden (DHA)	Persimmon Homes				Neither	4.21.1 It is not clear why SBC consider it necessary to include the level of detail provided as part of Policy HE1 given the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. In this regard, it is not for the Policy to set out additional burden on development over and beyond that of national guidance and other relevant statutory provisions. 4.21.2 Criterion (3) sets out that “great weight” should be given the conservation of Listed Buildings, however, the consultation NPPF (Policy HE6) sets out that ‘substantial weight’ should be given to the conservation of the asset. In the interests of effectiveness and ease of reference, SBC should review the wording to ensure consistency with the NPPF, which will allow for a more concise and clear policy framework.
2026Reg18/124	29	Question 093 Do you support or object to Policy HE1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent					See attached document 5.27.1In response to Questions 92 and 93 of the Consultation document Fernham Homes would comment that it is not clear why SBC consider it necessary to include the level of detail provided as part of Policy HE1 given the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. In this regard, it is not for the Policy to set out an additional burden on development over and beyond that of national guidance and other relevant statutory provisions. 5.27.2Criterion (3) sets out that “great weight” should be given to the conservation of Listed Buildings: however, the consultation NPPF (Policy HE6) sets out that ‘substantial weight’ should be given to the conservation of the asset. It is therefore imperative that the Policy is revised to ensures consistency with the consultation NPPF. 5.27.3In the interests of effectiveness and ease of reference, SBC should review the wording to ensure consistency with the NPPF, which will allow for a more concise and clear policy framework. In this regard, it is not appropriate nor justified for the Policy to seek to add any further layers of restrictions that are not consistent with national policy. 5.27.4With this in mind, it is clear that elements of the Policy could readily be contained within the pre-amble to the Policy. 5.27.5Criterion (5) sets out that where substantial harm or total loss of a Listed Building is permitted “building recording will be secured”. In this regard, we would highlight that this can be readily secured via Planning Condition. In the interests of brevity and providing a clear Policy we would recommend that this requirement be relocated within the Policy pre-amble.
2026Reg18/126	30	Question 093 Do you support or object to Policy HE1? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning		Support	Policy HE1 – Development Involving Listed Buildings Energy and AdaptationThe County Council supports this policy and would recommend adding in wording regarding climate adaptation – adapting heritage assets to the impacts of climate change is important to prevent their deterioration and loss. Historic England has provided guidance and further information here.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/120	Considers there to be too much detail provided as the NPPF has prescriptive and clear requirements. Therefore, the policy should not set out additional burdens on development beyond national policy and statutory provisions. Criterion 3 says that "great weight" should be given to the conservation of Listed Buildings: however, the consultation NPPF sets out that 'substantial weight' should be given to the conservation of the asset. Seeks amendment so policy ensures consistency with NPPF consultation.	The Council does not view the policy as imposing additional burdens; nevertheless, the wording can be clarified to better align with the NPPF. Partial change proposed. Comment noted. The NPPF is currently in draft form and remains subject to change. The supporting text and policy wording will be reviewed and updated, where necessary, to reflect any changes in a future iteration of the Local Plan. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/124	Considers there to be too much detail provided as the NPPF has prescriptive and clear requirements. Therefore, the policy should not set out additional burdens on development beyond national policy and statutory provisions. Criterion 3 says that "great weight" should be given to the conservation of Listed Buildings: however, the consultation NPPF sets out that 'substantial weight' should be given to the conservation of the asset. Seeks amendment so policy ensures consistency with NPPF consultation. Seeks amendment so that the policy wording is consistent with the NPPF because it is not justified to add more layers of restriction that are not consistent with the national policy. Criterion 5 sets out that were substantial harm or total loss of a listed building is permitted "building recording will be secured". This can be secured via planning condition. Seeks amendment to move this part of the policy to the preamble.	The Council does not view the policy as imposing additional burdens. No change proposed. The Council agrees that wording can be clarified to better align with the NPPF. Partial change proposed. The Council agrees that wording can be clarified to better align with the NPPF. Partial change proposed. The Council agrees that wording can be clarified to better align with the NPPF. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/126	Supports policy Seeks amendment to add wording regarding climate adaptation - adapting heritage assets to the impacts of climate change is important to prevent their deterioration and loss. Historic England has provided guidance and further information here.	Comments noted. No change proposed. Comment noted. The policy preamble will be updated to include energy efficiency and climate resilience to support climate change mitigation; this does not need to form part of the policy itself. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/16	34	Question 094 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Boughton under Blean Parish Council	Sarah	Muteham	§ 48.0.6 'Non-listed buildings (heritage assets)' looks like it should be a heading but why add 'heritage assets' in brackets? This is confusing as the text does not appear to be referring to non-designated heritage assets.		
2026Reg18/73	60	Question 094 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the preamble and considers it to be broadly comprehensive and consistent with: The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024); and National heritage guidance. General Comments The preamble clearly: Explains the purpose of Conservation Area designation; Recognises the cumulative impact of small-scale changes; Emphasises high design standards; Highlights the importance of character appraisals and management plans. This approach is supported. Suggested Improvements To make the preamble more focused and relatable, the following additions could be considered: 1. Stronger Emphasis on Local Identity The preamble could more clearly reference: The importance of Conservation Areas in maintaining village identity and historic character;		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/16	Queries why 'Non-listed buildings (heritage assets)'is mentioned in paragraph 48.0.6 as the text is not referring to non-designated heritage assets.	Comment noted. The Council agrees to delete this typo. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/73	Supports and agrees with the preamble Seeks amendment to have a stronger emphasis on local identity with reference to the importance of conservation areas in maintaining village identity and historic character and their role in supporting tourism and local pride and the contribution of historic cores to community cohesion. Seeks amendment to the preamble to strengthen the reference to cumulative harm and incremental change by giving clearer examples such as Loss of traditional windows and doors, Hard surfacing of front gardens Unsympathetic signage and lighting and Excessive traffic or parking pressure. Seeks amendment to the preamble to strengthen the setting and wider landscape regarding conservation areas by referencing 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. Seeks amendment to the preamble to strengthen reference to the public realm and highways by Encouraging early engagement with Kent County Council Highways, Promoting sympathetic materials and reduced visual clutter and Supporting traditional street furniture where appropriate.	Comment noted. No change proposed. Agree that paragraph 48.0.1 can include greater linkages to local identify. Change proposed. Partially agree that setting can be emphasised further hence reference to setting in paragraph 48.0.1. Partial change agree. Comment noted. Reference to setting has been strengthened within the preamble and not all conservation areas have a countryside setting. No change proposed. Comment noted. The preamble refers to highway works, and these have also been strengthen in paragraph 48.0.9. No change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/74	45	Question 094 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Faversham Society	Planning	Faversham Society	Para. 48.0.3 Although this paragraph specifically concerns neglect or decay of buildings in conservation areas, our comments above, under paragraphs 47.0.05 and 47.0.07. apply equally here. Para. 48.0.5We welcome and would wish to encourage the Council's use of Article 4 Directions. In recent decades there have been too many examples of the use in conservation areas of inappropriate materials such as uPVC doors and windows in place of timber or plastic rainwater goods in place of cast iron: these have frequently occurred in Article 4 areas. We would wish to see this paragraph strengthened by the addition of a clear commitment by Swale to the monitoring and enforcement of regulations in areas that are subject to Article 4 Directions. Para. 48.0.6The final sentence in this paragraph needs clarifying or deleting.Paragraph. 48.0.9We would ask that the words "street furniture and surface textures" are added to the list of features in the first sentence.		
2026Reg18/120	25	Question 095 Do you support or object to Policy HE2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	L	Sinden (DHA)	Persimmon Homes				Neither	4.22.1 As above, it is not clear why SBC consider it necessary to include the level of detail provided as part of Policy HE2 given the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. Indeed, the Policy should not seek to set out additional burdens on the delivery of development over and beyond that of national guidance and statutory provisions. 4.22.2 In the interests of brevity and providing a clear policy it is clear that elements of the Policy (i.e., Criterion (2) requirements) could be relocated within the Policy pre-ambles.
2026Reg18/124	30	Question 095 Do you support or object to Policy HE2? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent					See attached documents 5.28.1In response to Questions 94 and 95 of the Consultation document Fernham Homes would comment that it is not clear why SBC consider it necessary to include the level of detail provided as part of Policy HE2 given the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. Indeed, the Policy should not seek to set out additional burdens on the delivery of development over and beyond that of national guidance and statutory provisions. 5.28.2With this in mind, it is imperative that the Policy is revised to ensure consistency with the consultation NPPF, with particular regard to Policy HE9. It is not appropriate nor justified for SBC to seek to add further layers of restrictions or requirements that are not consistent with national policy. Indeed, SBC should remain cognisant of the response to Policy HE1, insofar as the consultation NPPF's revised weighting to be given to conservation of assets. 5.28.3In the interests of brevity and providing a clear policy it is clear that elements of the Policy (i.e., Criterion (2) requirements) could be relocated within the Policy pre-ambles.

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/74	this paragraph specifically concerns neglect or decay of buildings in conservation areas, our comments above, under paragraphs 47.0.05 and 47.0.07. apply equally proposals to alter, change the use of, or demolish listed buildings often come after periods of neglect, which may sometimes be intentional. While acknowledging that a building's condition is not officially a valid planning justification, it notes that poor condition inevitably influences decisions. The Faversham Society recommends adding a requirement that, when such applications involve buildings in poor condition, the heritage statement must explain why the building has deteriorated. Regarding paragraph 48.0.5, welcomes and encourages the Council's use of article 4 directions, but they have not been effectively enforced in conservation areas as inappropriate materials are still used. Wants commitment from SBC to monitor and enforce these regulations in these article 4 direction areas. Seeks amendment to the final sentence in paragraph 48.0.6 either with clarification or deletion. Seeks amendment to paragraph 48.0.9 to add "street furniture and surface textures"to the list of features in the first sentence.	Comment noted. No change proposed. Agreed that paragraph 48.0.6 requires amendment for clarity and to address typo by deletion. Change proposed. Agreed that paragraph 48.0.6 requires amendment for clarity. Change proposed. Agree that paragraph 48.0.9 can include greater scope. Change proposed.
2026Reg18/120	Unclear why SBC has given the level of detail due to the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. The policy should not seek to set out additional burdens on the delivery of development beyond national guidance. Seeks amendment to move some elements i.e criterion 2 could be moved to the preamble.	Comment noted. The Council does not consider that the policy imposes additional burdens beyond national policy. However, the wording can be reviewed to improve clarity, reduce any perception of over-prescription, and ensure it aligns with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding clear and effective decision-making policies. Partial change proposed. The Council disagrees. Criterion 2 is not descriptive it is a set of requirements that identifies what proposals will be assessed against and which directly informs whether development is acceptable. This element is consistent with the approach of the NPPF, which requires clear and effective policies that support decision-making. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/124	Unclear why SBC has given the level of detail due to the prescriptive and clear requirements of the NPPF. The policy should not seek to set out additional burdens on the delivery of development beyond national guidance. Seeks amendment so the policy is consistent with the consultation NPPF, particularly HE9. Seeks amendment to move some elements i.e criterion 2 could be moved to the preamble.	Comment noted. The Council does not consider that the policy imposes additional burdens beyond national policy. However, the wording has been reviewed to improve clarity, reduce any perception of over-prescription, and ensure it aligns with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding clear and effective decision-making policies. Partial change proposed. Comment noted. The NPPF is currently in draft form and remains subject to change. The supporting text and policy wording will be reviewed and updated, where necessary, to reflect any changes in a future iteration of the Local Plan. No change proposed. The Council disagrees. Criterion 2 is not descriptive it is a set of requirements that identifies what proposals will be assessed against and which directly informs whether development is acceptable. This element is consistent with the approach of the NPPF, which requires clear and effective policies that support decision-making. No change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	88	Question 096 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Eastchurch Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council agrees with the preamble and supports the recognition and protection of historic parks and gardens within the borough. Suggestions to Improve Focus and Relatability 1. Clearer Link to Local Identity and Public Benefit The preamble could be strengthened by briefly explaining how historic parks and gardens: Contribute to Swale's sense of place and historic identity; Provide public enjoyment, education and tourism value; Support biodiversity and landscape character; Contribute to wellbeing and access to green space. Making these links more explicit would help residents understand why their protection is important. 2. Stronger Reference to Setting While the importance of registered sites is clear, the preamble could more clearly emphasise: The importance of protecting their wider landscape setting; The impact of development on key views into and out of these parks; The need to avoid incremental erosion of their designed character. 3. Recognition of Locally Important Parks and Open Spaces The reference to undesignated parks and gardens is welcomed. This could be enhanced by:		
2026Reg18/76	95	Question 098 Do you have any specific comments on the preamble above? What would help make it more focussed, relatable or complete?				Five Parishes Opposition Group			(Representation received after the 5pm deadline, 23rd Feb 2026. Also note attached document). Paragraphs 50.0.1 to 50.0.7 provide a clear description of and policy approach to Non-designated Heritage Assets. However, FPG would recommend that the preamble explicitly acknowledge the significant variation in heritage value within this category. Non-designated heritage assets range from those of modest local interest to those of considerable significance—potentially comparable to Grade II Listed Buildings—which may not have been captured during formal designation processes. Without such clarification, there is a risk that applicants and decision-makers may underestimate the planning weight that should be attached to higher-value non-designated assets.FPG recommend adding a statement to this effect, making it clear that non-designated status does not equate to minor significance.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Supports the preamble. Seeks amendment to preamble by explaining how historic parks and gardens contribute to Swale's sense of place and historic identity, provide public enjoyment, education and tourism value, support biodiversity and landscape character and contribute to wellbeing and access to green space. Seek amendment to preamble to emphasise the importance of protecting their wider landscape setting, the impact of development on key views into and out of these parks and the need to avoid incremental erosion of their designed character. Seeks amendment to the preamble by emphasising that smaller or locally valued historic landscapes also contribute significantly to community character and linking to Swale's Heritage Strategy and Conservation Area Appraisals where relevant.	Comment noted. No change proposed. Comment noted. The Council recognises these wider benefits; however, the preamble is intended to describe the designation rather than list associated social and environmental benefits. However, minor edits are required to correct wording, improve clarity and consistency with policy terminology and the NPPF. Partial change proposed. The issues raised are already addressed in Policy HE3, particularly in relation to setting and key views, so no further amendment to the preamble is necessary. No change proposed. The preamble already refers to locally important historic landscapes and directs these to Policy HE4, so no further change is required. No change proposed.
2026Reg18/76	Paragraphs 50.0.1 to 50.0.7 provides a clear description of the approach to non-designated heritage assets. Seeks amendment so that the preamble to acknowledge the significant variation in heritage value. Non designated can be compared to grade II listed buildings in some cases, with no clarification, there is a risk that they may be underestimated in planning weight.	Comment noted. Comment noted. This amendment is not necessary as the supporting text already explains that non-designated heritage assets vary in type and significance, and this is further addressed through the policy's case-by-case assessment approach. No change proposed. The Council disagrees as it is not appropriate to equate non-designated heritage assets with listed buildings, which are subject to a separate statutory and policy regime. The policy already allows for appropriate weight to be given to significance in individual cases, consistent with the NPPF. However, for clarity and to correct grammatical errors two paragraphs require slight revision. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Comment Number	Consultation Point Name	Agent/organisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submission - Consultee Organisation	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/124	31	Question 099 Do you support or object to Policy HE4? What would you add, remove or amend to support it further or to remove your objection?	DHA Planning	G	Filmer	Fernham Homes c/o Agent				Support	See attached documents 5.29.1 Fernham Homes broadly support the inclusion of Policy HE4 which reflects that of national policy guidance and the consultation NPPF, we would however comment on the Policy wording in response to Questions 98 and 99 of the Consultation document. 5.29.2 Criterion (1) highlights the use of SBC's Local Heritage List and its use for seeking to retain and conserve Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs), this inclusion is supported by Policy HE1 of the consultation NPPF which highlights the importance of Development Plans being supported by local lists to identify NDHAs. However, to ensure a justified Policy, it is imperative that the Plan is supported by an up-to-date list of NDHAs, the current SBC Heritage Strategy for Swale is dated March 2020. 5.29.3 The Policy sets out a requirement that "Prior to any approved demolition, alteration, extension or restoration of non-designated heritage assets, the Council may require appropriate building or archaeological recording, relevant to the asset's significance and the scope of works". In the interests of brevity and providing a clear Policy, this element should be reviewed and moved within the Policy pre-amble as this can be secured sufficiently as part of a Planning Condition as required.
2026Reg18/19	2	Question 103 Do you have any further comments to make on any aspect of the consultation that you haven't yet made?				Lower Medway Int. Drainage Board			Overall, we consider the Plan to be very strong, particularly in its treatment of flood risk, drainage, and strategic coastal defence. The approach to the Medway Estuary and Swale (MEAS) strategy is especially well articulated and clearly justified against national policy, including the tests for planning obligations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The clarity around benefit areas, proportionality, and the relationship between development and strategic flood risk infrastructure is welcome and provides a robust policy basis for future decision-making. We have only three minor points to note. First, references to the Internal Drainage Boards should be updated to reflect that, from 1 April, the Boards will operate under the name North Kent Marshes Water Level Management Board, following the forthcoming amalgamation. We would be grateful if this updated name could be reflected in the final version of the Plan where relevant. Second, we note and welcome the policy references to drainage and flood risk management (including the sections attached). We would be very happy to continue to support the Council in the interpretation and application of these policies as the Plan progresses, specifically in relation to the planned Planning Guidance to assist in the interpretation and application of climate and water related policies. Third, the Board is content that Policy C9 appropriately addresses sustainable drainage in planning terms. If helpful, the Council may wish to consider a brief signpost in the supporting text to the need for separate IDB consenting where development affects ordinary watercourses, to aid clarity for applicants. Development proposals that introduce water to, or affect flows or volumes within, ordinary watercourses may also require separate consent from the relevant Internal Drainage Board, in addition to any planning permission. Applicants are encouraged to engage with the Board at an early stage. Thank you again for producing such a well-considered Local Plan. We look forward to continuing to work constructively with the Council as it moves towards		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/124	Supports the policy criterion 1's SBC's Local Heritage List and the conservation of non-designated heritage assets is supported by Policy HE1 and the drat NPPF, but the plan should be supported by an up-to-date list. SBC's is dated March 2020. Seeks amendment by moving the sentence "Prior to any approved demolition, alteration, extension or restoration of non-designated heritage assets, the Council may require appropriate building or archaeological recording, relevant to the asset's significance and the scope of works" to preamble.	Comment noted. The Council's Local Heritage List was adopted in 2024, updated in 2026, and is available here: https://swale.gov.uk/planning-and-regeneration/heritage-and-landscape/local-heritage-list The Council disagrees, as supporting text does not carry decision-making weight. Its inclusion within the policy provides a clear hook for securing recording by condition and is necessary to ensure the policy is effective. However, the policy should be updated to improve clarity, consistency with the NPPF, and its effectiveness in decision-making. Partial change proposed.
2026Reg18/19	Overall, consider the Plan to be very strong, particularly in its treatment of flood risk, drainage, and strategic coastal defence. The approach to the Medway Estuary and Swale (MEAS) strategy is especially well articulated and clearly justified against national policy, including the tests for planning obligations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The clarity around benefit areas, proportionality, and the relationship between development and strategic flood risk infrastructure is welcome and provides a robust policy basis for future decision-making. References to the Internal Drainage Boards should be updated to reflect that, from 1 April, the Boards will operate under the nameNorth Kent Marshes Water Level Management Board. Note and welcome the policy references to drainage and flood risk management. Would be happy to continue to support the Council in the interpretation and application of these policies as the Plan progresses. Is content that Policy C9 appropriately addresses sustainable drainage in planning terms. It may be helpful to add a brief signpost in the supporting text to the need for separate IDB consenting where development affects ordinary watercourses, to aid clarity for applicants. Suggests text: Development proposals that introduce water to, or affect flows or volumes within, ordinary watercourses may also require separate consent from the relevant Internal Drainage Board, in addition to any planning permission. Applicants are encouraged to engage with the Board at an early stage. Thanks the Council for producing such a well-considered Local Plan.	Noted. All references to the Internal Drainage Boards will be updated to theNorth Kent Marshes Water Level Management Board. Change Proposed. Noted. The Council agrees to this suggested addition to the pre-amble. Change Proposed. Noted.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/64	8	Question 104 Have we missed any terms from the glossary or anything from the list of acronyms?	Laister Planning Ltd	David	Hancock	Country and Coastal Parks 3 Ltd			Introduction 1.1. The question requests feedback on any terms from the glossary that would be useful to include. Response 1.2. Within the Glossary section the following definitions of 'brownfield land' and a 'caravan' are stated as: "Brownfield Land: land that has been previously developed but is not currently in use, and may be potentially contaminated due to its former industrial or commercial use." "Caravan: Mobile living vehicle used by Gypsies and Travellers; sometimes referred to as trailers. Also used for holiday accommodation." Definition of Brownfield Land 1.3. For the definition of brownfield land we recommend the council aligns with the NPPF definition which is the same as previously developed land "Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape." Definition of Caravan 1.4. The House of Lords decision in 'Wyre Forest 1990' (Wyre Forest District Council and CoS and Others 1990 19 A.C. 2571) dealt with a permission		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/64	Seeks amendment to the glossary to the term brownfield land. Seeks amendment to the glossary to the term caravan.	The Council agrees to change the definition of brownfield land because this definition should be inline with the NPPF.Changes proposed. The Council agrees to change the definition of brownfield land because this definition should be inline Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960. Change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/71	3	Question 104 Have we missed any terms from the glossary or anything from the list of acronyms?		Rhian	Casey	Kent Holdco LTD			Introduction Question 104 on page 191 requests feedback on any terms from the glossary that would be useful to include. Response Within the Glossary section the following definitions of 'brownfield land' and a 'caravan' state: "Brownfield Land: land that has been previously developed but is not currently in use, and may be potentially contaminated due to its former industrial or commercial use." "Caravan: Mobile living vehicle used by Gypsies and Travellers; sometimes referred to as trailers. Also used for holiday accommodation." Definition of Brownfield Land There is no requirement for brownfield land or previously development land to not be in use and therefore vacant to be defined as such. For the definition of brownfield land, we recommend the Council aligns with the NPPF Annex 2 Glossary definition for previously developed land. "Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape." Definition of Caravan		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/71	Seeks amendment to the glossary to the term brownfield land. Seeks amendment to the glossary to the term caravan.	The Council agrees to change the definition of brownfield land because this definition should be inline with the NPPF. Changes proposed. The Council disagrees with changing the definition of caravan to the one suggested because that is defining twin unit caravans. The Council believes that the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 has a more appropriate definition. Partial change proposed.

Appendix I: Schedule of representations, summaries and proposed changes to the regulation 18 Local Plan consultation

We are aware that in some of the cells of the original rep the text disappears/is not always clear. However, for the full original rep, please see it online at Objective. Instructions on how to do so re in Appendix II.

Submission Number	Com ment Num ber	Consultation Point Name	Agent/org anisation	Agent - first name	Agent - Surname	Submissio n - Consultee Organisati on	Consultee - First Name	Consultee - Surname	Original Response	Vote	Vote - Comment
2026Reg18/73	69	Question 104 Have we missed any terms from the glossary or anything from the list of acronyms?				Eastchurc h Parish Council	Sarah	Poole	The Parish Council considers the glossary and acronym list to be comprehensive and helpful. However, the following additions and clarifications may improve clarity and completeness: 1. Terms That May Be Worth Adding to the Glossary 1. Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA)This term appears in policy but is not clearly defined in the glossary. A short definition explaining that it identifies areas at risk of coastal erosion where development is restricted would be helpful. 2. TranquillityThe term is used throughout landscape policies but is not defined. A definition could reference the NPPF description of areas relatively undisturbed by noise and visual intrusion and valued for amenity and wellbeing. 3. Setting (of a heritage asset or landscape designation)Frequently referenced but not clearly defined in the glossary. A definition aligned with the NPPF would be useful. 4. Irreplaceable HabitatUsed in biodiversity and woodland policies. Although referenced in national guidance, it would assist clarity to define it locally (e.g. ancient woodland, veteran trees, etc.). 5. Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural LandWhile referred to in policy, a short glossary definition would assist non-technical readers. 6. National LandscapeThe term replaces AONB in national policy. It may be helpful to clarify in the glossary that “National Landscape” refers to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. 7. Coastal SqueezeAlthough defined, it may be helpful to cross-reference this term clearly to coastal and biodiversity policies. 8. Public Benefit (heritage context)Used repeatedly in heritage policies. A short explanatory definition referencing the NPPF approach to balancing harm and benefit could assist understanding. 9. Net ZeroThe term is referenced indirectly in climate-related policies but is not clearly defined. 10. Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA)This is referenced in landscape policy but is not clearly defined in the glossary.		
2026Reg18/126	31	Question 104 Have we missed any terms from the glossary or anything from the list of acronyms?				KCC Strategic Planning		KCC Strategic Planning	Glossary Public Rights of WayThe County Council considers that the definitions of 'active travel' and 'green infrastructure' are both welcomed. The addition of Public Right of Way (PROW) – 'A way over which the public has a right to pass and repass, including public footpaths, public bridleways, restricted byways and byways open to All Traffic' is recommended to assist understanding for all readers of the Plan, and all references within the Plan to PROW should then be standardised for consistent understanding.		

Appen

We are aware

Submission Number	Comment Summary	Draft Comment Response
2026Reg18/73	Seeks amendment to add Coastal Change Management Area, tranquillity, setting, irreplaceable habitat, best and most versatile (BMV) agriculture land, national landscape, coastal squeeze, public benefit, net zero and landscape sensitivity assessment to glossary. Seeks amendment to add BMV and MEASS to the acronyms Seeks amendment to add LSA and EIA to the acronyms Seeks amendment to remove SME from the acronyms as there is a duplication Seeks amendment to add reference to the Environment Act to the LNRS acronym Seeks amendment to clearly state National Coastal Erosion Risk Map for NCERM	The Council agrees to add these terms to provide a clearer understanding for readers. Changes proposed. The Council agrees to add these acronyms to provide a clearer understanding for readers. Changes proposed. The Council disagrees to the addition these acronyms as they are not used the document, but if they are used in the future then they will be added. No changes proposed. The Council agrees to remove SME because it is a duplicate. Changes proposed. The Council disagrees because the list of acronyms is not the place for this. No changes proposed. The full name is in the list. No changes proposed.
2026Reg18/126	Seeks amendment to add Public Rights of Way to the glossary and PROW to acronyms.	The Council agrees for the following reason, this will assist the readers with a better understanding of the Plan. Change proposed.