

Annex 3 – Consultation Responses

Cliffsend Neighbourhood Plan Area

Question: Do you support the proposed Cliffsend Neighbourhood Plan Area?	Question: Do you support the proposed Cliffsend Neighbourhood Plan Area? Comment
No	How can people be asked comment when there is no facts given, apart from a very unclear map and a statement,
Yes	
Yes	We need to keep cliffsend a village
No	The plan area as shown in the map includes the Pegwell Bay Nature Reserve which is not within the village and is managed by KCC. Apart from that it's OK.
Yes	I think Cliffsend desperately needs better public transport to support the non-drivers of the community. It is nigh on impossible to get a bus to Cliffsend past 5pm and to get to Westwood Cross from the village takes around an hour what with having to get a bus to Ramsgate Harbour and then catch a connection to any onward destination in Thanet. This is unsatisfactory if Cliffsend is to be a viable place to live for those with young families or non-drivers.
Yes	I am interested in any development that may include using greenfield sites, and a new railway station, also if public money is to be used.
Yes	I think it is an excellent way of consulting those that live and work in the area. We would like to encourage a friendly community atmosphere within the village.
Yes	If the council keeps to the proposed agenda for Cliffsend I have no objections
Yes	To give the residents more say over decisions about the area
Yes	Seems to be a sensible boundary. Perhaps the part extending towards Sandwich is a bit long, and seems to stop in the middle of the road and not at a junction, but all the houses and roads I consider to belong to Cliffsend are included.
No	The map used for the plan is not representative of features on the ground: the new East Kent Access road is omitted. The document also states that the Country park is not included as this is managed by Kent Wildlife Trust but appears to be included within the marked boundary. Before there is a plan to go forward lets have the right map to show it on and the correct area marked!
Yes	

Yes	<p>As part of the Local Plan Millwood Homes have put forward a site of approximately 5 hectares in the village to the south of the railway line, within the Neighbourhood plan area. The site relates to identified strategic aspirations for the creation of a Thanet Parkway Station that is seen as improving connections, the economic potential of Thanet and the development of Discovery Park. This Plan offers a method for residents to influence how the proposed parkway Station relates to the village and ensure that the environment of the village is not detrimentally affected. The parkway will alter Cliffsend, it will gain an important transport link that will ensure its future viability as a self contained settlement and will require consideration of development of amenities in the village and the nature of that expansion. It is also important to consider how the village can take advantage of the situation. The existing Millwood development demonstrates how a well designed scheme contributes to the quality of the village, its extension could also contribute to open space and amenity provision at the heart of the village and provide affordable housing, improvements to the village hall, the provision of a shop/ heath facility for the village, traffic calming and improved pedestrian and cycle connections and landscaping and ecology. The scheme rounds off the village and has little impact upon existing development. The centre of the village would benefit from public realm improvements including traffic calming, the site fronts two of the main access roads and offers the potential to provide these improvements. Discussions can take place with bus services to improve public transport connections. The site is connected to the Viking Coastal trail. In the Neighbourhood plan document it is notes that Roads, Transport, Utilities, Housing, Public Open Spaces, Medical Provision and Children's Activities were areas of concern. This site can help address all of these concerns.</p>
Yes	<p>Because I hope it may give residents in the area more say as to how the its developed. Uniquely it has some of the most beautiful and important sea views in England across peg well bay which have now mostly been lost from view by the raised bank along side the new road by the airport, which is a shame as it was the first view of the sea for incoming tourists.</p>
Yes	<p>To keep it as a village and not joined up to Ramsgate. To keep green wedges between any development outside village boundaries (ie Manston Green and Ramsgate, Pegwell village areas). For the villagers to be able to have a say on what is happening in the village and to keep it as a village.</p>
Yes	<p>It seems a logical boundary but I have found it difficult to ascertain whether this is in effect ant change to Cliffsends current village boundaries. It seems to include the nature reserve in its entirety rather than be split even though managed by other bodies - although you say it is excluded it seems to be in the red line.</p>
Yes	<p>Village stay within its boudnary with ancient roots not joining with Pegwell and the proposed Manston Green. Community spirit is to be rekindled with village and field available to use. Fairs and sports. See the ancient footpath once joining the Roman Road reopened promised when the East Kent Access Riad was finished in 2012.</p>

	<p>Thank you for consulting the HA regarding the above. The HA is responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), comprising motorways and trunk roads. In the vicinity of Thanet the SRN comprises mainly the A2 (Brenley Corner to Dover Docks). On the basis that the 2 proposed Neighbourhood Plan areas do not contain, nor are particularly close to any part of the SRN, the HA has no comments to make on the respective proposed boundaries.</p>
	<p>We would like to thank you for involving Kent Police in these consultations. Kent Police have been working with the local planners, KCC and architects to develop the Kent Design Initiative (KDI), Design For Crime Prevention document, which is a Kent Design Guide for Developers, Designers and Planners. The purpose of this document is to provide summary guidance for Planners, Developers and the Police to ensure that all development proposals incorporate the principles for designing out crime, and as such may also be of interest to any Neighbourhood Planning Groups. The KDI document has been endorsed by the Chair of Kent Planning Officer Group (KPOG) and the Chief Constable of Kent. We hope the attached Design For Crime Prevention document will assist in the consultation process and should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) Team at Force Headquarters on 01622 653234/653209 or via email at pandcr@kent.pnn.police.uk .</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>There is very little on the TDC website to respond to; merely an area identified on a map. 2. The statement submitted by Cliffsend PC is undated and now inaccurate.2a. The sub-committee referred to was improperly constituted. Meetings were never announced or public invited. Minutes were not recorded. As recently as January 2014, the council, by majority vote, has decided to re-designate and retrospectively attribute any work undertaken by such groups as that of Working Parties. 2b. There has been one public meeting as mentioned on 28th February 2013. There has been no analysis or feedback through council of contributions posted on the 'walking wall'.3. In view of 2(above) there has been no 'engagement' with residents of Cliffsend. 4. On the Cliffsend PC website, whilst there is a site page for the Cliffsend Community Plan, there seems no mention of the Neighbourhood Plan other than a diary note of the consultation time line and links directly back to the TDC web site. 5. Cliffsend residents have already participated in a village wide questionnaire in May 2011. This was undertaken by the Cliffsend Community Planning Group (CCPG) which had the encouragement and financial support of the parish council. Nearly half the households responded to the 70 or so questions. These were separately analysed and a report produced. The report was handed to the Cliffsend PC in April/May 2013 with the request that the contents be viewed and, where practicable and relevant, adopted and pursued by the PC. 6. Although another sub-committee / working party was established to 'deal with the CCPG', there has been no apparent useful engagement by the PC.7. The most sensible way forward is to constitute a Neighbourhood Plan under the auspices of the CCPG. I believe this group already has a written constitution and would have no difficulty involving 21 people or more from the community.Unfortunately, not only has the parish council wasted opportunities to work with members of the CCPG in the interests of the community it has also stalled, prevaricated and wasted much valuable time. It would appear to be trying to re-invent the aims of the CCPG under the umbrella of its own Neighbourhood Plan.As far as the consultation process is concerned, the Cliffsend Neighbourhood Plan as currently presented through your website does not have my support.</p>

	<p>Thank you for letting me know about these NPs. One of the best sources of information on the natural environment is the Magic web-based which is an interactive map service that brings together environmental information from across government. The system can be accessed through http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</p>
	<p>Thank you for consulting on the Neighbourhood Plans for Margate and Cliffsend. I confirm I have no comments to make at this stage.</p>
	<p>Given that your Forum is among the very first to be developing a neighbourhood plan, I have no doubt that there are many who are seeking to have an input and to steer your deliberations in a particular direction. This is perhaps not surprising, given that local people have, for the first time, been given a real voice in deciding how development will look in their area over the next 10 years. Without wishing to add yet another voice, I wanted to take this opportunity to raise the issue of the provision of specialist housing for the elderly and to encourage you to give due attention to the needs of the elderly when considering your evidence and drawing together your plan. You may not be aware that the number of people aged 65 and over in the UK is set to grow from 10 million now to 17 million by 2033. This will place significant financial pressure on public resources, health and social care services. Decent, suitable housing in later life is one of the keystones to ensuring health and happiness in old age; housing is fundamental to how we manage demographic change. If it would be considered helpful, McCarthy & Stone, Britain's leading provider of retirement accommodation, would certainly be able to offer you our assistance and expertise. Over the past 30 years, we have built more than 40,000 retirement homes for more than 45,000 customers. I should stress that such advice and assistance is offered on a completely no strings; basis and does not relate to any proposed development by McCarthy Stone in your area. We pride ourselves on our commitment to public consultation and continually strive to ensure the community is involved in shaping our schemes. We are keen to work with local groups to help us learn how to engage under the new neighbourhood planning processes. I am enclosing some information as a starting point for discussion. However, if it would be useful, we can provide further data, or indeed deliver a short presentation to the Forum on how to consider the needs of older residents. If you would like one of us to meet with your group, then please do get in touch.</p>