

Annex 1: Summary of consultation responses from Statutory Consultees

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>https://res.cloudinary.com/commonplace-digital-limited/image/upload/v1770025333/projects/66141b65e0f4436148cf409d/respondent-upload/sfhitmz9s0ygytpcim6.pdf</p>
<p>Flood risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments made in response to specific sites including EP1, HS1, EP2, TO5, TO7, TO8, TO9, TO10, HI2, WO1, E8, AY2, E7. • The basis of the comments is to highlight / inform that parts of these sites are within Floodzones 2 or 3 and that mitigation will be required and / or the consideration of these areas for open space should be considered. • The EA also request financial contributions from sites located in the Medway Estuary and Swale Strategy (MEAS) area. This includes areas around Aylesford to Halling and Wouldham. The EA note that it is relevant to sites WO1, AY2 and E7 but may also be relevant to other sites. The EA wishes to work with TMBC (and other Councils) to establish a funding mechanism. <p>Groundwater and contaminated Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA were disappointed to note that the Local Plan did not mention groundwater source protection zones or safeguard zones or a specific policy related to the protection of water quality (including groundwater). The EA also comment that groundwater or water quality has not been included in the assessment of site allocations. It is noted that many of the allocations are located within vulnerable areas. The EA stipulate that groundwater quality protection should be a key driver for assessing site allocation suitability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers have noted the comments and where relevant will control development through policy. • A Strategic Flood Risk Level 2 Assessment which will provide more detailed site floodrisk information is currently being progressed. • The MEAS will be considered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and discussions with the EA will take place to ensure that those sites that require a contribution are identified. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers are currently drafting a policy to ensure that the EA's concerns are addressed. • Officers will shortly collaborate with the EA to ensure that draft policies including draft site allocation policies meet the expectations of the EA in

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA wish to see Policy CC8 and text associated to Sustainable Drainage Systems to include mention of water quality. • The EA provide advice in relation to Suds involving infiltration, designing and mitigating climate change, foul water, groundwater protection, piled foundations, non-main drainage and solutions. • The EA also comment in relation to suitable waste water infrastructure and requests for Policy INF1 to make specific reference to waste water infrastructure. The EA state that they will object to major development sites that do not upgrade sewer capacity in the area. The EA note that this is for the local planning authority and utility company to manage in terms of timing for release of permissions for sites being developed. <p>Land contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA advise that the plan should review its terminology around land contamination and contaminated land. The EA are in agreement with Policy NE11. However, updates and improvements to the policy have been suggested. <p>Policies within the Regulation 18 Local Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments provided in relation to policies CC8, NE1, NE5, NE6. Amendments to supporting text within the Plan also proposed. 	<p>relation to the matters raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy and where applicable supporting text will be revised to ensure this is included. • Advice is noted and where relevant will be included in supporting text and / or policy as relevant. • The policy will be updated. A second round of testing sites and phasing of development in relation to sewer capacity is underway with Southern Water. • Terminology will be reviewed and the Policy will be updated. • All comments will be considered and taken forward as appropriate.
<p>National Highways</p>	<p>https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4648/national-highways-redacted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stipulate that ‘vision’, ‘Validate’ and ‘Monitor and measure’ approach should be a golden thread running through the Local Plan, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan to be updated to ensure the vision and

<p>supporting evidence and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content that the Council is meeting the Duty to cooperate and support the progression of a Statement of Common Ground. • Comments made in relation to text within Chapter 2, chapter 4, Chapter 5 and chapter 13. • Comments made in relation to the Transport evidence Forecast Baseline Report. NH confirm that an acceptable methodology has been applied and are considered suitable. • NH query some results from the Local Plan Tests Report. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A decrease in traffic at M20 Junction 5 and the reason for this. ○ A request to provide data for certain junctions in certain scenarios by additional plots for the A229. ○ A request for information to be submitted to NH for M20 junction 5. ○ LOS rating confirmation and checking. • NH also note that mitigation options will be required and set out key work streams required. However, are satisfied that the junctions that need to be considered have been identified. • NH comment on the Local Plan Junction Modelling Report including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note that further work will be undertaken for Reg 19 stage, which is an acceptable timeline. ○ M20 Junction 4, junction 7, Junction 6 to be examined carefully. As well as M2 Junction 3 and Junction 18b. • NH content that junction modelling has been undertaken as appropriate for Regulation 18. However, further work is required for Regulation 19 once the preferred strategy is identified. 	<p>validate approach runs through the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue collaboration with NH. • Ensure comments are embedded by the transport consultants in the transport evidence for the Regulation 19 work.
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>Response submitted via consultation platform - https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/local-plan/draft-local-plan-regulation-18-responses-2025</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the historic environment as a key element in the Local Plan vision and the built environment as a Local Plan objective. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Policy HE1: Historic Environment and agrees that the Local Plan achieves the requirements of the NPPF. • Notes that the local plan can identify opportunities to conserve the historic environment, such as site allocations positively addressing heritage assets at risk, and can help to ensure that site allocations avoid harming the significance of heritage assets (including effects on their setting). The plan can also be used to inform the nature of allocations, so development responds to and reflects local character. • Site allocations should be informed by an evidence base and an analysis of potential effects on heritage assets. Historic Environment Advice Note 3 contains advice on site allocations in local plans, including the steps that should be taken during the site selection process with regard to the historic environment and heritage assets. • Heritage evidence – Confirms that published and further evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further detailed evidence for sites is underway to inform site allocation policies for the Regulation 19 Local Plan.
<p>NHS Property Services</p>	<p>https://tonbridgeandmallingbc.s harepoint.com/:b:/s/Regulation18LocalPlanRedactedConsultationPDFs/IQBMRS8D5Z_4Q7HemytFq1gCAdKu5bpsvbsYpOuPzm3DDok?e=IAvOxQ</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasises that the NHS as a whole is facing significant funding constraints and population from new development adds further pressure. New development should make a proportionate contribution to funding healthcare needs from new development and this should be at the forefront of priorities for infrastructure delivery. Planning policies should enable the delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and be prepared in consultation with the NHS to ensure they help deliver estate transformation. • Policy H2: Affordable housing – The Council should consider housing for NHS staff and those employed by other health and care providers as key workers in the entire local authority area. NHS property services recommend ongoing engagement with NHS partners, ensure that affordable housing for NHS staff is factored into housing need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policies and supporting text to address comments where applicable. • Key worker housing is considered under the general affordable housing policy and rural housing exception policy. However, we will seek further advice from our consultants on this matter.

assessments and other policies as relevant (economy) and consider site selection and site allocation policies in relation to any identified need for affordable housing for NHS staff, where sites are near large healthcare employers.

- Policy INF1: Provision of infrastructure and services – Health infrastructure should be identified in the Local Plan as essential infrastructure and development proposals should make a contribution to support the development and growing demand on services. Smaller housing growth should also be considered cumulatively. Effective implementation mechanisms should be set out in the Plan in a specific section to determine the appropriate form of developer contributions including liaising with healthcare providers for any new or improved provision.
- The Council should liaise with the Integrated Care Board (ICB) to add further detail within the Local Plan and the IDP regarding details about developer contributions mechanisms and appropriate contributions.
- INF4: Community facilities: NHSPS supports the provision of community facilities but does not consider the policy to be effective in its current form. The NHS wish to see a more flexible policy with regards to its estate, in particular the disposal of sites and properties which are redundant or no longer suitable for healthcare is a critical component in helping to fund new or improved services within the local area. Requiring the potential for alternative community uses or to retain some community provision adds unjustified delay to vital reinvestment in facilities and services for the community. Proposed modifications to the policy have been suggested.
- Health and wellbeing – Recommends the inclusion of a comprehensive policy on healthy places and to engage with the NHS in its drafting. Suggestions as to what to include in the policy are provided.
- Health Impact Assessment (HIA) – Recommends the Council to set out its own HIA requirements to help implement its strategic objective on healthy communities.

- These matters are already covered in the Local Plan, however, we can liaise with the ICB as part of our ongoing collaboration to ensure that the plan and the IDP satisfactorily addresses points made.

- Modifications will be reviewed and the policy will be updated accordingly.

- Policy will be investigated and added.

- Policy will be investigated and added.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure evidence base – Request for the Council to engage with the ICB on an ongoing basis as part of the preparation of the IDP. This includes identifying costs for healthcare infrastructure and for this to be included as part of any viability testing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council engages regularly with the ICB. Including sharing information about potential site allocations and requesting information about new and improved healthcare infrastructure needs and costs.
<p>Marine Management Organisation</p>	<p>https://tonbridgeandmallingsbc.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/Regulation18LocalPlanRedactedConsultationPDFs/IQC28rcl1mcbSIJemmTH5PsVASLkfzUwt9CmylH_ac-SXdY?e=sxECXd</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of recommendations made including highlighting that the South East Marine Plan is of relevance. Many of the recommendations are not relevant given the location of Tonbridge and Malling. Other recommendations include those around heritage assets, habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration, climate change, air quality, prevention of marine litter, restoring water quality, sustainable tourism and recreation, enjoyment of the marine environment, habitat adaption or connectivity, environmental net-gain. • Would welcome reference to the South East Marine Plan within chapter 2 of the Local Plan. • Would welcome reference to the requirement of a Marine License for certain activities carried out within a marine area – this affects a small section of Tonbridge and Malling – the tidal river Medway. • Would welcome a reference to the marine/coastal/intertidal element of the area, particularly where both terrestrial and marine habitats have the potential to be impacted by the Local Plan. • Recommends for the South East Marine Plan policies to be used as evidence to support the preferred approach and options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References and recommendations will be considered and the Plan updated where applicable.
<p>National Grid</p>	<p>https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4650/national-grid-electricity-transmission-redacted</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies that site EC1 is located in close proximity to a National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET). It is recommended for a site allocation policy or other policy to include wording that recognises and responds to the presence of the NGET infrastructure and suggests suitable wording. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording will be considered and included as applicable.
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>https://tonbridgeandmallingbc.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/Regulation18LocalPlanRedactedConsultationPDFs/IQBMRSD5Z_4Q7HemytFq1gCAdKu5bpsvbsYpOuPzm3DDok?e=IAvOxQ</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends for the Plan to go further in its vision to contain a vision for the natural environment over the plan period and to commit to nature recovery alongside climate resilience given that they are linked. Welcome landscape evidence but consider it is unclear how this has informed site selection process of reasonable alternatives with regards to sites allocated in the setting of national landscapes. Advises for the Plan to adopt a definition of major development with regards to National Landscapes. Comments on the following policies – SP1: Spatial Strategy, SP3: Settlement hierarchy, SP4, Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople, SP7: Green Belt (support), SP8 Green Belt, SP9: Local Green Gap, Comments on climate change policies, Natural Environment policies, Design Policy, Housing policies H5 and H6, economy policies E1, E2 and E5. Policy R8 Farm diversification and R10 Equestrian policy, INF2, INF4 and INF5. Comments provided on a number of sites in relation to mitigation required for either National Landscapes, Ancient Woodland, designated nature sites. Request for Landscape evidence to be explicitly accounted for in the Sustainability Appraisal for its next iteration. Habitats Regulations Assessment – Further information / consideration requested for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matters raised will be considered and included as applicable in the Regulation 19 Plan. Comments relating to the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment will also be considered and taken forward.

<p>allocations close to North Downs Woodlands SAC.</p>	
<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>https://tonbridgeandmallingsbc.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/Regulation18LocalPlanRedactedConsultationPDFs/IQCIVQbJDZST5EHYn7JFxQDAVB0TOh4FuIJHya0Hw6SJAY?e=3luFln</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the inclusion of transport and infrastructure improvements in the vision. Transport improvements should be embedded in policies throughout the plan including site allocation policies as relevant. • Supports the justification for the spatial strategy, including development close to railway stations. However, this is provided that where growth would have an impact on the railway from a capacity or safety perspective that mitigations are secured. • NR will continue to work with the Council to identify railway impacts that need to be addressed to allow for development growth with no adverse impacts on the railway. • Supports the principle of SP1: Spatial Strategy. However, has a number of comments in relation to part 10, which refers to Tonbridge Town Centre and improvements which can be made through development to the north and north-east of the station. • A request for allocations to contribute to improved pedestrian and cycle links to the station as well as other infrastructure enhancements. • Request for consideration of development at Borough Green and whether additional car parking may be required. • Request for consideration of other stations as to whether improvements are required to facilitate growth including Barming Station, West Malling Station and Snodland. • Request for sufficient funding to be secured for supporting rail infrastructure and where required the use of Grampion conditions to phase development alongside infrastructure provision. Other funding streams highlighted and requested to be embedded in the IDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All matters raised will be considered and the Local Plan and IDP will be updated accordingly.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirms that the IDP is up-to-date. The latest Tonbridge Strategic Station Plan (2025) should be referred to. • INF1: Infrastructure is supported. Suggestion to include the use of planning conditions in the policy. • INF2: Sustainable Transport and Active Travel is supported. Suggested to have regard to the Tonbridge SSP and that specific mention to station access, cycle hubs, accessibility upgrades should be made in paragraph b. The policy could more actively support the railway. • INF3: Parking. Confirms that it is important that station car parking is kept separate from parking provided for new development. Additional onerous requirements for providing additional station car parking to meet demand should not be put in place. Parking at stations is currently being reviewed for large stations in Kent, for which Tonbridge falls into consideration. • Supports the allocation of TO7 Land north of Priory Road, south of the railway, Tonbridge and requests for the allocation yield to be increased to between 159-265 dwellings. 	
<p>NHS Kent and Medway</p>	<p>Response available from consultation - https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/local-plan/draft-local-plan-regulation-18-responses-2025</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Spatial strategy (Policy SP1) but expect the impact on health infrastructure to be fully mitigated through developer contributions. This includes timely delivery of on-site land and contributions for healthcare to ensure capacity available through new infrastructure at an agreed point in the development and transferred to the trust at nil consideration and timely availability of developer contributions to support the expansion/ upgrading of off-site healthcare facilities. It is requested for contributions to be made early so that infrastructure can be in place for the occupation of development. • The NHS will continue to liaise with the Council with regards to infrastructure provision, however, they note the strategic development proposed at Borough Green, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review policies and supporting text and the IDP to ensure that comments from the NHS are reflected. Continue to work with the ICB to help inform the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

<p>North Tonbridge, Aylesford which will require new facilities and developer contributions. Land and contributions for a new ambulance facility is also requested. Other sites will also need to contribute to healthcare facilities. It is expected that the growth will require an increase to both elective and non-elective services and therefore expanded/reconfigured infrastructure at Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Kent and Medway (ICB) Developer Contributions Guide will inform ICB requests for developer contributions, both on and off site – this includes the impact on primary, community and acute healthcare. The assessment for each area considers primary and community healthcare at a high level (not service specific) and the shift of services from hospital to community in line with The NHS 10 Year Health Plan and neighbourhood health model of care. 	
<p>South East Water</p>	<p>https://res.cloudinary.com/com-monplace-digital-limited/image/upload/v1770303531/projects/66141b65e0f4436148cf409d/respondent-upload/rea1xyg9ngccdd4ibcbm.pdf</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) 24 sets out how SEW intend to maintain the balance between increasing demand for water and available supplies over the next 50 years up to 2075. SEW responded to say that they are unable to accommodate additional growth beyond what was assumed in the WRMP24 in areas where there is no supply-demand surplus, this includes Tonbridge and Malling. The growth in the Local Plan is above that which has been forecast and would cause significant stress to water supply system. • SEW would need to recalculate the demand forecast and re-run decision making process to help identify additional interventions, such as new supplies, transfers, or increased demand reduction programs, which will not be known until work is complete for the next Plan, WRMP29. The timetable for publishing is May 2027, with a draft published in March 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has been working with SEW, MHCLG, DEFRA and the Environment Agency to address the matter of water supply to ensure that growth can be supported in the Local Plan. This work is ongoing to ensure that there is sufficient water supply to support the growth within the Local Plan.

<p>2028. The baseline forecast will be developed in Spring 2027 and proposed interventions identified in Spring 2028.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New water supplies and infrastructure development – There are several planned schemes within the current business plan and there will be a need to carry out work at a localised level based on growth and new developments once known in the area and early consultation is welcomed. SEW are committed and willing to engage early in relation to planning applications. • Demand Management – Aim to reduce household consumption to 110 litres per person per day by 2050. Would like the Local Plan to be more ambitious aiming for 100 litres per person per day by 2025 and 90 litres per person per day by 2030 and 80 litres by 2035. Sustainable design standards are welcomed. Plans should incorporate methods to validate developer claims regarding water efficiency. • Source protection – Urge for LPA's to take account of Environment Agency's groundwater source protection zones (SPZ's) to safeguard drinking water, to mitigate pollution risks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan Reg 18 policy sought 110 litres per person per day. This will now be reviewed to support a reduction in household consumption. • A policy will be included in the Plan to ensure that SPZs are protected.
<p>Southern Water</p>	<p>https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4739/251223-southern-water-reg18-lp-response</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy – Strongly support all policy requirements which seek to ensure that surface water is appropriately managed, as close to source as possible. Request and suggest additional wording in part (10) of the Policy to acknowledge how the stated investment in the public realm will incorporate SuDS. • Policy CC3: Sustainable Design and Construction – Requests and suggests wording to account for the construction phase of development and also for design and construction to also ensure a watertight foul system. • Policy NE9 Noise, Vibration and Odour – Request and suggest additional wording to account for the planning system requirements on locating development, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All policy suggestions will be reviewed and the Local Plan updated accordingly.

<p>the 'agent of change principle' that places responsibilities on the incoming 'agent of change' in relation to odour for example from an existing waste water treatment works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy CC8 Sustainable drainage systems – Requests and suggests wording in relation to run-off from development, discharge of surface water and SPZ's. • Policy H10 Residential Extensions, Alterations – Requests and suggests additional wording in relation to ensuring that rainwater is not discharged to a foul sewer. • Policy R10 Equestrian Facilities in the Countryside – Requests and suggests additional wording to help protect the quality of the water environment. • INF1 Provision of Infrastructure and services – Request and suggest additional wording to protect the utility network and to safeguard the provision of utilities. • INF3 Parking – Request and suggest additional wording to help ensure parking areas make use of permeable surfaces (or integrate SuDS). • Policy A1 Housing and employment allocations – Confirm important considerations in relation to the design of sites to protect waste water treatment works, SPZs, critical sewers or where sites are near an operational pumping station. 	<p>Comments on sites are noted and will be taken forward in either general policies as applicable and / or site allocation policies.</p>
<p>Kent County Council</p>	<p>https://res.cloudinary.com/commonplace-digital-limited/image/upload/v1769005104/projects/66141b65e0f4436148cf409d/respondent-upload/fbzq3zfp0m9ttf0wcut1.pdf</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General commentary provided by the Highways and Transport team, Minerals and Waste, Waste Team, Planning for health and Education team. Key matters raised included: • Support for the spatial strategy as provided; would like to see waste and minerals plans referenced in the Plan; satisfaction for Policies CC6, CC7 and CC8; that household waste and recycling centres at Tovil HWRC, Maidstone and North Farm, Tunbridge Wells 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments are noted and the Local Plan policies and supporting text will be updated as relevant.

are at/ near capacity; that the Local Plan demonstrates a commitment to health but certain sections could be expanded to ensure comprehensive coverage as well as additional policies dedicated to Health and Wellbeing. It is also suggested for TMBC to consider a hot food takeaway and fast-food outlet policy; That continued work and liaison with KCC to assess the need for additional schools takes place.

Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy –

- Highways and Transport – Supports the allocation of growth in and around settlements and suggests some additional or amended wording.
- Welcomes the potential to provide a relief road early for Borough Green Gardens draft allocation but suggests that this will need to be tested within the transport model to determine whether some dwellings can be built prior to the relief road, as it may affect the viability as well as associated improvements to the rail station and local bus services. Pedestrian and cycle infrastructure improvements should also be explored.
- Transport impacts from large site allocations will need to be understood in relation to their transport impact with improvements in line with a sustainable vision. However, transport modelling at the Regulation 18 stage has confirmed that the growth proposed can be achieved subject to mitigation. More detailed modelling will be progressed for Regulation 19.

Policy SP3: Settlement hierarchy – Highways and transportation team support the settlement hierarchy. The ability to achieve sustainable travel modes on connected routes from proposed allocations needs to be considered.

Policy SP5: Future employment growth – Highways and transport support the policy where development sites are in sustainable locations.

Local Plan key diagram – Minerals and waste are concerned that no mention of any constraining effect of the safeguarded mineral deposits or safeguarded waste management and mineral processing infrastructure are not

- Comments are noted and the Local Plan policies and supporting text will be updated as relevant.
- Discussions have taken place to ensure that the transport model identifies this.

- This work is in progress.

- Noted and this is a factor considered as part of allocating sites.

- Whilst this has been considered, further work will be undertaken as appropriate and discussions with KCC will take place to address any concerns.

considered. The relevant Kent Minerals Waste Local Plan should be referred to and addressed in the Local Plan with regards to relevant policies. Where draft allocations conflict with the policies then these should be subject to assessment of whether there are justifiable grounds to invoke any exemption from the presumption to safeguard.

Climate change chapter – Policies supported with some suggested additions to Policy CC1, CC4, CC6, CC8.

Natural Environment chapter – Policies generally supported with specific comments on planning for health, heritage conservation and landscape, green and blue infrastructure and woodland and trees, with offers of collaborative working.

Historic environment chapter – KCC commented upon the Heritage Strategy, that KCC would support the creation of a local list of heritage assets, made suggestions to policy HE1, HE2, HE4 and HE5 and questions whether Policy HE6 is needed as this is covered in other policies.

Design chapter – Suggest reference is made to the Kent Design Guide, which should be available by the time the TMBC Local Plan is in place.

Housing chapter – Request for continued liaison around adult social care infrastructure and asks for inclusion on what future provision should focus on as well as recommendations for policy inclusions on rebalancing residential provision, accessibility standards, supported living, modernisation and cost-effectiveness, assistive technology.

Supporting rural communities' chapter – Plan could mention the Kent Downs AONB Farmstead Guidance in assessing proposals.

Infrastructure and Services chapter

- TMBCs continued support for S106 contributions for libraries; request to mention adult education including S106 contributions; S106 contributions welcomed for development investment in the absence of better schemes.
- The County Council considers that unless a transport infrastructure project is already in the County Council's infrastructure programme or where it has confidence that

- Comments made on the below chapters / policies and supporting text will be considered.

contributions will be sufficient, S106 contributions for schemes required to mitigate development impact will **not** be accepted. Instead, developers will be expected to progress and deliver schemes with oversight from the County Council via the S278 Agreements 16 process outlined in paragraph 13.5. This is to minimise delivery risk and ensure mitigation comes forward as the associated development(s) progresses.

Policy INF1: provision of infrastructure and services

- Development investment – request that payment triggers on smaller developments happen earlier in the development process to prevent default of payment and that effective monitoring of contributions takes place as KCC is no longer a party to S106 agreements.
- A joined-up approach to viability assessments would be welcomed.
- Requests for an additional narrative that puts an expectation on the developer to investigate viability mitigation funding schemes before requesting a reduction in contributions towards local infrastructure and service provision. Updated text requested.
- Suggestions made to update text / policy in relation to paragraphs 13.20 and 13.22 including a monitor and manage policy to support the delivery of transport measures and ensure travel patterns to ensure that the vision and validate approach is achieved.
- KCC welcomes continued close working on the IDP and for highways mitigation measures to be included, noting it will be for the developers causing the impact to be responsible for delivering the mitigation. A request to identify each developer against each infrastructure measure and to use the Kent transport model to identify this.
- A request for a sustainable transport study is made.

Policy INF2 – Sustainable Transport and Active Travel

- Policy recommendations made for Part 1, part 3e, 4 and 5d including around car clubs, mobility hubs, travel planning, adaptive cycle parking facilities and prioritising non-motorised travel.

Strategic sites

- A number of matters mentioned including on-site schools and walking and cycling connections being required prior to the opening of the school; maximising flexibility in S106 wording for schools infrastructure, preventing split school sites.

Policy INF3 - Parking

- Requests policy / supporting text to be updated.

Chapter 14 – Development Allocations

- TMBC needs to evidence that it has considered the Waste and Minerals Local Plan in relation to safeguarding sites. It notes the safeguarding of the Folkestone Formation belt is of great significance.
- Borough Green will need to be assessed against the presumption to safeguard this mineral deposit from sterilisation, prior extraction is one potential solution that should be explored.
- Long term conservation of minerals should be recognised by the Local Plan.
- Further work within the TMLPD could be done to demonstrate the plan's ability to meet the County Council's position on mineral safeguarding in general and with regard to the Folkestone Formation in particular.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- Section 9 of the Infrastructure Delivery Schedules mentions County Council funding in areas where it has responsibility (e.g. highways). The County Council should not be included as a potential funder unless funding is secured through government funding bids that are specifically allocated to that scheme.
Delivery of any mitigation because of the local plan should only consider developer-led schemes as stated previously within our consultation response.
- The County Council would encourage TMBC to review the provision of overnight lorry parking in its Local Plan.

- Comments on site allocations will be considered as further work is progressed for the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

- The IDP is a live document and is being progressed further alongside the Regulation 19 Local Plan.