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KCC Statement Matter 4

Matter 4 Other Strategic Locations
[Core Strategy policies: SS6, SS7]

Issue 4: Are the Core Strategy’s proposals for Shorncliffe Garrison and Folkestone Seafront realistic, deliverable, adequately justified and consistent with national and regional policies?

Issue 4.1 Shorncliffe Garrison
a) Are the location, boundary and proposed mix of uses in this strategic allocation adequately justified?

Support and Master Plan

4.1 In response to the Submission Document of July 2011 KCC submitted the following support for Policy SS7 and the Spatial Strategy for Shorncliffe Garrison.

“KCC supports the inclusion of Shorncliffe Garrison as a strategic allocation and the requirement for a satisfactory master plan for the whole site before planning permission can be granted. However the approval of a master plan should precede consideration of a planning application. The clause which indicates that a planning application that is accompanied by master planning in parallel should be deleted from the policy as it is important that the principles of development of the site should be established and agreed with the community in plan form first before the regulated procedure of processing a planning application is begun.”

4.2 Para 4.157 refers to the MoD and Shepway Council working closely on master plan documents, and this is confirmed by amendment Y90 (January 2012 Submission paras. 4.154 and 4.157). KCC is content that the local plan provides a clear commitment to a master plan approach for the important Shorncliffe Garrison site.

School capacity

4.3 KCC also submitted the following detailed comments on the Policy SS7 (4th bullet) and proposed similar changes to para. 4.169:

“The proposal includes on-site provision of appropriate community infrastructure including land and (delete “possible”) contributions towards the building of a two form entry new primary school and health/care facility (and/or delivery of a community/public facility of equal social value).”

The word “possible” should be removed to avoid any doubt that a new school will be required at Shorncliffe Garrison. The addition of the words “the building of” is necessary to make clear that in addition to the provision of land, contributions will be necessary towards construction of the school buildings.

The following sentence should also be added:

“There will also be a need for contributions towards the cost of providing additional secondary school places required within existing school facilities.”

4.4 Amendment S36 removes the word ‘possible’ from Policy SS7 as KCC requests, and also inserts ‘up to’ two-form entry, although no reference is made to the building of the
school, nor to contributions towards the cost of additional secondary school places. Amendment Y98 would also remove the word “possible” from para. 4.169 (January Submission para. 4.165).

4.5 KCC supports Amendments S36 and Y98 which remove any doubt that land of about 2ha and contributions to on-site provision for a primary school will be needed.
Issue 4.2 Folkestone Seafront
a) Are the location, boundary and proposed mix of uses in this strategic allocation adequately justified? What alternatives were considered, and why were they discounted?

Support and Master Plan

4.6 In response to the Shepway Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document of July 2011 KCC submitted the following support for Policy SS6 and the Spatial Strategy for Folkestone Seafront.

“KCC supports Folkestone Seafront’s inclusion as a strategic site in the Core Strategy in view of its significant prospective contribution towards Shepway’s housing requirements, regeneration of Folkestone town centre and enhancement of Folkestone’s tourism offer. Any development here will need to relate well to the wider area (coastal park, town centre, harbour, creative quarter), and the recently produced Masterplan provides a trigger to consideration of the whole area as a single entity. Given the prominence of the site, its importance to Folkestone as a whole, and the architectural opportunity the site presents, design quality is of paramount importance here.”

4.7 Para. 4.144 refers to further master planning of the development, and the amended text (January 2012 Submission paras. 4.138 to 4.148) demonstrate awareness of the character and opportunity of the site, and its relationship to neighbouring areas. **KCC is therefore content that the local plan provides a clear commitment to a master plan approach for the important Seafront site.**

School capacity

4.8 KCC also submitted the following detailed comments on Policy SS6:

“The policy makes no mention of the new school provision that is required. The development of Folkestone Seafront and Shorncliffe Garrison will together require developer contributions to support a new two form entry primary school. An additional clause should be inserted to the policy:

“Development should not proceed unless and until provision is made for the additional primary school places required, not necessarily on the site. There will also be a need for contributions towards the cost of providing additional secondary school places required within existing school facilities.”

4.9 Amendment S33 would insert a new clause (f) in Policy SS6 which states:

“Appropriate financial contributions are provided to meet additional school pupil places generated by the development”.

4.10 **KCC supports Amendment S33 which refers to financial contributions to meet additional school pupil places in general generated by the development.**