

## BOUGHTON AND DUNKIRK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ONLINE CONSULTATION / FINAL COMMENTS

### Question 2

#### Are you generally in support of the Plan's Objectives?

The plan is an intelligent, caring approach to protecting Boughton and its cultural and natural heritage for now and future generations. By not putting the developers profits first. Small-scale, truly sustainable housing (Passivhaus / Agile eco builds) are the only viable way forward. Over-development is accelerating the declared Climate and Ecological crises we are all in - not working within the declaration is contravening it. Now Is The Time for communities to say no more to the Developers demands for profits. It is many decades overdue. The whole planning system needs to be flipped on its head - developers should go through a rigorous bidding system and the one that most closely fits the environmental bill should be cherry-picked by both the community and council together. All decisions must now be an environmental decision - from Central to local Government and all of our communities and businesses. If we want our planet to be sustainable. There are also many empty homes and buildings, and the Government are slowly realising (through people protesting) that their extortionately high housing targets are ruinous. Links: <https://www.passivhaustrust.org.uk/> <https://agile.property/> <https://www.actiononemptyhomes.org/>

Yes, on the limiting of further developments in the parishes. The need to maintain a break between Faversham and the parishes is crucial to avoid being part of "metropolitan" Faversham.

Yes, need to protect the villages and countryside.

A very comprehensive plan. Each of the areas impact upon the other so all very relevant.

Pleased to see the guiding principles expanded in appropriate detail.

Yes, the Plan's objectives and indeed its vision is totally in agreement with my own views.

I feel it is vital for the villages of Boughton and Dunkirk to have greater and more direct control over development in their rural communities and the Plan looks to achieve an important balance between sustainable development and the protection and conservation of heritage assets and countryside areas.

Yes, although the plan is heavily weighted towards protecting the villages, with lesser regard for the outlying areas.

Very good plan. Vital we protect the gap to Faversham; the Nash court land area should be part of the plan to protect it and keeps the heritage of the area. Equally the fruit belt to the North makes the character of Boughton, as well as recreation, environmental benefits ...too many benefits to list - this needs to be protected from development, stop Boughton becoming a Faversham suburb.

Points of feedback to improve:

1. The street needs crossing points for pedestrians, wheeled transport mode, children and push chairs - the current lower kerb points are blocked by cars always making crossing dangerous - again encouraging car use rather than walking around the village - improve non car connectivity of village.
2. The idea of moving the school would be disastrous - its location in the heart of the village by the village hall and playing fields connects the village and brings people away from the cars of the street enabling social interaction.
3. Further recreation provision - fully agree this is needed for older children, but equally the village hall facilities add a lot to the area and should be looked to be improved upon. This should not be reliant upon village fundraisers but budgeted for parish benefit. Improving pathways around the field to link Walking access to designated footpaths improves will encourage non car transport as well as can be used for health and leisure. Currently the field is boggy in winter or wet after rain, so you have to walk the rode avoiding cars from school and village hall car park - destroying any flow, relaxation or rural feel of a walk.
4. Covid impact - many more are working from home, so increased connectivity and care for local area - walking routes, social clubs need to be encouraged to support all generations.  
There is a clear gap for working-aged people. Similarly, to support this one premier shop (offy) is not enough and the plans need to encourage more business in the village heart, offering better healthy food and non-alcohol connecting space e.g. community café.
5. Entrance and exit points of village need to be preserved - the current entrance points have wonderful views of oasts, hop fields, listed historical buildings making Boughton unique and different e.g. than Faversham, the value and importance of this needs to be preserved.

Overall, very good plan supportive of the proposed housing development location to meet village housing needs, which in itself needs to closely scrutinise what and how this is defined.

It is important for villages to keep their separate identities from major towns such as Faversham, and not to be swamped with excessive developments that destroy our countryside and important farmland - which now that we are out of the EU - should be used to full potential for growing more of our own food instead of importing.

I think this is important to retain Boughton and Dunkirk as villages and maintain the rural aspect.

Looks to reflect public opinion.

In favour of keeping our individual identity and not becoming part of the planned sprawl of housing estates in Kent

### Question 3

#### Are you generally in support of the Housing Policies?

As long as there are no other developments planned in the village. We need to maintain the heritage of Boughton and make sure it stays a village.

These must only be small-scale and building upwards sensitively and creatively. There is a limit on the number of new homes to the village, and we have more or less reached that. It cannot be an ever-increasing continuum.

I support the plan as outlined, with the limited housing development. I strongly object to the proposed Duchy land development of over 2000 houses. This is far too large a development and will change the nature, character and quality of life in a very negative way for the foreseeable future.

Yes, they are consistent in maintaining the character of the villages.

Very much support the policy of limited infill style development. With the development in the Faversham/Love Lane area, the overall provision of amenities is very concerning. You rightly point out that Swale is least well provisioned for General Practitioners.

Too much housing.

The call for land was a good idea to ascertain where might be possible. I am in support of trying to support local people to continue to live in the village. Also, the clear objectives to look at the nature of the building (of any potential new homes) is very important. The wonderful heritage of some of the very special buildings along the street and South Street should be maintained at all costs.

The Garden Hotel is mentioned in passing as an "eyesore site" in need of refurbishment, but I could not see any mention of consideration of housing here as a way of bringing the building back into use and good repair. It was submitted as a SHLLA site for the Swale local plan and has been included as an allocation. The SHLLA submission was for 30 dwellings, this has been reduced to a maximum of 20 within the plan, several of which presumably would be within the refurbished listed building. Should this go into the plan?

I agree with the focus on local resident priority and affordability.

Pleased to see reference to architecturally appropriate design such as pitched roof specification.

I understand the necessity for housing within the Swale area and think that this planned approach for Boughton and Dunkirk has been well considered. I agree that small developments of this nature should be allowed to aid the current community and bearing in mind the historic importance and outstanding beauty of the area together with an eye to the immediate and future needs for developing a safe, sustainable and pollution free environment for residents.

The policies give a welcome focus on selective and modest new development combined with the ability for residents to be able to downsize and for housing to be made available to those with a local connection. So often people have to relocate elsewhere because suitable and affordable housing is no longer available for those who grew up in the villages or who have been resident for many years. I would also support the emphasis on good design criteria and for off road parking to be created.

Yes, BUT - the prospect of a 2,550 home development by the DoC needs far greater opposition from the local and Parish councils.

Excessive housing means greater strain on local medical facilities that are already inadequate and also water supplies - where is all the millions of gallons of additional water to come from?

It is very difficult for young people you grew up here to continue to live in the villages due to house prices. "Affordable housing" is not always affordable for these young people, so small social housing developments should be possible on the edge of the village envelope. They try to protect Faversham's encroachment.

I am pleased to see that The Garden Hotel site has not been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for housing development as the level indicated by the Local Plan would definitely create added traffic problems on 'The Street', but given the state of disrepair that the property is falling into, what plans would the village councils have for the building / site? Could there be pressure from SBC to develop it at their desired levels, as it falls within the Neighbourhood Plan objective of focusing 'development within the village envelope and by the promotion of the use, recovery and restoration of previously developed sites'? Has Boughton council / Neighbourhood Plan group made representations to Swale Borough council against the inclusion of the 'Duchy land' in the Local Plan - especially as it was added rather unexpectedly?

Agree some affordable housing is required but do not see why it is so bad for people to move to different locations to find suitable...

#### **Question 4**

##### **Are you generally in support of the Traffic and Transport Policies?**

I think it is imperative to start planning for the phasing out of internal combustion engine cars which is happening in 2030. Immediate consideration needs to be given to implementing electric car charging facilities throughout the neighbourhood. Many practical solutions are available at the current time, including 'pop-up' charging points which are hidden below ground until required, lamp post charging points, gully systems to allow charging cables to go under the pavement from house to car, charging stations which can rapidly charge multiple cars in a parking area, etc. Many people are reluctant to change to an electric vehicle as they do not have off-road parking, which is an issue for many, especially along 'The Street'. Early adoption of electric vehicles will make the environment and atmosphere better for all in terms of poisonous emissions and reduced engine noise. A 20mph speed limit should also be included in any planning as this will not only provide a safer environment for PEOPLE in the village but will also cut down on much of the congestion which occurs in the village, particularly at the bottlenecks mentioned in the plan. MANY of these bottlenecks would be reduced if traffic is generally slower, meaning

that drivers have more time to anticipate vehicles coming the other way and stop to allow them to pass BEFORE they get stuck at a spot which makes passing more difficult.

The village can only cope with a VERY small number of new houses due to its infrastructure. I can't understand why you have agreed to the development on Bull Lane when this is very narrow and the traffic at school times is already horrendous. Can you do anything to restrict the traffic through the village when there is an accident on the A2?

I agree all new homes should have off-road parking as standard. Also bicycle sheds, and electric charging points for vehicles. Also, the roads should be tiled so as to natural slow down traffic, and create a sense of place with perennial shrubs / flowers planted (in planters) in the middle to give a place to let people safely cross, and to stop HGVs using the unsuitable roads. Also consider Sundays where no motorised traffic is allowed in the village at all to increase community well-being and bring down air pollution. Many other places are doing this... <https://secretldn.com/regent-street-summer-streets/>

Greater caution and scrutiny required on proposals from SBC. The developments in Faversham are impacting directly on our access to facilities not available in the parishes.

One area I feel the Plan is silent on - and should be added is the interconnected-ness of the road network in the area. Where an incident occurs on the M2 London-bound, this can quickly cause chaos in Boughton & Dunkirk due to drivers following their sat-nav devices to find diversions in addition to volume of traffic. Coupled with the narrowness of Boughton, passing buses and impatient drivers - the village quickly grinds to a halt. You quickly feel like a prisoner in your own home; the short errands of family life become hours-long ordeals.

Brenley Corner needs to be redesigned to accommodate the extra traffic but this will lead to more green space being lost.

Yes, traffic a huge problem in the street, Boughton. The idea of off-street parking should be looked at more in my view. What about The Garden Hotel as one of the off-street parking places? Or pockets of land along the street possibly behind houses??

The transport policies are quite car-focused, and while off-road parking will reduce parking problems, this in turn encourages car ownership, and once cars are owned, they tend to be used, with all the attendant problems of congestion, pollution and lack of physical

activity. However, it has to be acknowledged that most people will need to use a car at some point, but minimising their use needs to be a key consideration. There is mention of cycle routes but no detail, and more emphasis on the danger posed by cyclists, rather than the danger they face in using the most efficient, healthy and environmentally friendly form of transport. (rant over!).

The route to Faversham in particular could play a role in reducing car use. The background documents state there is not sufficient width for a dedicated cycle lane, however this is not the case for the old A2 from Brenley Corner to Stockers Hill. A eastbound cycle lane here would make this section safer, as cars tend to travel at high speed in this direction, while westbound there is much less traffic.

Rationalisation of the signage on this route would be important, so that the link from Stockers Hill to the crossing at Brenley Corner does not require local knowledge. After Brenley Corner, there may be potential with the East Faversham development for a continuation of an off-road route all the way to and through the development and linking with the 20mph zone in Faversham if this is continued. Although this section would lie outside the neighbourhood plan area, if cycle use is to be encouraged from/to the village, a complete route is needed, and so it would seem appropriate to lend the support of the neighbourhood plan to this. For leisure cycling/ walking and horse-riding designating Dawes Road as a Quiet lane would be useful, as this is frequently used for these purposes and links the built-up area with the bridlepaths at Holly hill. The process for this requires the demonstration of community support, and the neighbourhood plan would seem a good way of doing this. Other roads could also be considered, for example Dunkirk Road South. I agree that transport to and from the school is an important issue to be addressed as this has a significant impact on congestion which is noticeable by its absence in the school holidays.

Agree that traffic management is a priority. There is an urgent need for properly managed parking for car sharers and effective litter prevention.

The traffic and transport policies as laid out in the plan would appear to be sensible. I understand that a lot more work is necessary to make an ideal traffic and transport system for the area.

It is so important to balance new development with road capacity and this has been carefully considered in the Plan given the traffic congestion already evident in Boughton. The policy to resist housing development in the countryside and surrounding villages is very sensible and necessary.

The M2 J7 at Brenley Corner has been in need of upgrade or redesign for years. The idea of building more than 2,000 houses close to the junction is irresponsible. The A2 from J7 down into Faversham is frequently static and air quality is becoming markedly worse .

Need crossing point on street - equally will slow traffic.

More houses - equals more cars, more pollution.

Anyone moving to Boughton Street should recognise that there is limited parking and should consider that when thinking of buying a property.

Big problem in both villages, proposed Winterbourne fields would destroy both villages.

Anything that reduces traffic on The Street and Canterbury Road through Dunkirk is welcome.

### **Question 5**

#### **Are you generally in support of the Business and Employment Policies?**

I don't believe that there are any viable opportunities for Business in the Village. This is likely to have another impact on parking in the street which is already a nightmare.

We need to support small businesses that are of direct benefit to our community, not big storage units at Brenley Corner etc. Encourage a creative / music cafe, apprenticeship warehouse spaces to teach our young, a farmers market / deli shop for all the producers surrounding us to easily sell to us. A gallery space showcasing our horticulture heritage - to attract tourists and educate and interest all those who live here. The village is lacking a cultural heart at the moment for a lack of all of these things. It is large enough to support many new creative and grass-roots ventures for the benefit of many.

Need to promote local businesses more.



It will be great if local youngsters can find work locally.
I fully support the policies to reuse redundant buildings where practicable and to encourage small scale enterprises which can often add to the vibrancy and prosperity of the villages as well as leading to more local employment.
Need more shops heart of village.
I support businesses that are part of the community.
Reflects a positive attitude to business development.
Although I don't see many businesses wishing to operate in rural settings - unless their business is a rural one.

### **Question 6**

#### **Are you generally in support of the Community Wellbeing, Education, and Health Policies?**

We need a Doctors surgery back in the village to serve both communities. Anything for teenagers in the village is a waste of time as all they do is vandalise what is put in place. i.e. the recreation park benches. All footpaths should be maintained regularly to encourage use rather than having to resort to walking on farming land. A School bus would be a great idea to reduce the amount of people that drive very short distances to take their children to school. The school should not be extended anymore. It has already been extended several times and is no longer in keeping with the traditional style of the original building. I find it hard to believe that properties very close by are under conservation, but the school isn't. Also, I expect that if the School was moved that someone would look to develop the site, which would go against this plan.

See ideas in comments above [Business and Employment Policies] as to involving and educating young people in the local heritage and skills. There needs to be an Eco hub which can help the school make more environmental choices and be more involved and aware as to local issues.

What is the solution to access to GPs? SBC need to put this on the top of the list. That is a major issue as the only practice in the parishes is now closed and we all have to go outside the parishes. Planning need to include development of other GP facilities within Faversham.

As mentioned earlier - the net effect on the health and education services of the Boughton/Dunkirk plan needs to be seen in the wider context of the Faversham area - school provision is not the best and health provision sub-standard when viewed per capita. A further point is the rigid scheme of free bus passes that draws secondary schoolchildren into Faversham (due to the very slight proximity to Faversham) whereas Canterbury schools may provide sound alternatives.

The school does need to look at its use of mobile huts going into the future. An extension or re siting of the school seems a good idea. With regard to GP surgeries - you make the case very well for more GP's!

I am not sure of the rationale for moving the school from its current site, as its central location seems ideal.

There are many opportunities for walking and cycling locally. There may be a need to ensure that footpaths are prevented from being ploughed and farmed in a minority of cases.

I understand that we currently have difficulties in supply of these services in the immediate area and appreciate the necessity to work towards enabling local services rather than making a difficult situation impossible.

If we have learnt any lessons from the Covid pandemic then the importance of open space and opportunities for recreation cannot be over emphasised. The policies to create cycle trails and improve sports facilities are to be applauded.

School location, building aesthetic should not be changed.

In reality it will be difficult to get the numbers of walkers and cyclists hoped.

Outside areas/spaces are key to mental wellbeing. A local primary school is good for the village community, but understand Boughton primary is at capacity now and some are moving out of the village to gain access to a primary school for their children. i.e. move to Canterbury.

### Question 7

#### Are you generally in support of the Environment, Landscape Character, and Design Policies?

This is critical to be stringent with - to maintain the conservation area and as a horticultural / fruit belt.

I would very much like FTTP Broadband to Boughton/Dunkirk. It is curious how the local FTTP Broadband build-plan misses Boughton/Dunkirk but includes both more populous and far smaller settlements in the immediate vicinity.

Need to keep Faversham and Boughton separated by green space.

The fruit belt both north and south and the conservation areas and the Blean are so distinctive that we must strive to maintain them against future unwelcome changes.

This is critical; once a landscape has been damaged it can become a model for further damage.

I support the initiatives and policies to protect the landscape and green spaces and for any new development to be in harmony with the cultural and heritage assets associated with the villages. An important consideration is the planned control of any redevelopment of residential gardens and to limit the impact of light pollution. The protection of the Local Countryside Gap with Faversham is particularly important.

North fruit belt needs protecting and no building: vital entrance to village.

It is so important for small communities to keep their village character.

Developments should be in keeping with the rural environment and the conservation areas.

We must protect the countryside and settlement gaps.

The more we protect the natural world the better as we rely closely on its wellbeing for our own.

### Question 8

#### Do you have any general comments about the Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan?

We need to keep the rural environment. Cannot have any developments locally that put more pressure on local services, (medical, schools, etc.) or on the road infrastructure.

Too many developments around this area, more pressure on schools, dentists, and hospitals. Kent is so overpopulated already!!

It covers all the main points of concern and I am pleased to support its aims.

I think that it is a good plan providing that it actually holds some weight with the councils and that they don't override it. I have been a resident in Boughton for over 25 years. My parents were born and raised here so I have strong family ties. I have seen the village expand considerably over the years and feel that we are already at the point where we are starting to lose the "Village feel".

Worried about impact of new houses on already-strained road system and resulting loss of green space and wild land.

The objectives are sound and need our full support. The only concern is how protected are we from SBC lack of clout when dealing with the Government and we end up being sacrificed.

I would like to see more distinct verbiage that protects farmland - the Plan (in my opinion) treats land as fungible, and this is most certainly not the case. The aesthetic contribution of the farming land to the villages is as important as their economic contribution.

Generally a very good plan.

The plan is extremely comprehensive. Thank you to all contributors for putting in so much time and effort for the wider community. We all cherish this lovely place and are grateful for your hard work.

The East Faversham development will clearly have an impact on the road network, but otherwise may have less direct effects on the villages. School provision could conceivably be improved, as the plans include new primary and secondary schools. The border issue does need to be resolved.

Well thought through. I appreciate the massive amount of time that has been contributed to this for the benefit of future generations.

An excellent and well considered Plan with which I heartily concur.

In my opinion the Plan is a well-researched and comprehensive planning document which would provide the local parish councils with important policies to be able to influence new sustainable development in their area whilst safeguarding the open countryside and heritage assets, and promoting the economic, social and cultural vitality of the villages.

The NP should give equal weight to the whole area that you are responsible for representing and not over-focus on the villages. Tinbridge Oast (where I live) is mentioned just once in a 55-page document, with the prospect of 2,550 homes being considered that would surround and engulf us. Surely this is a MAJOR consideration for you? We need you to vigorously oppose the DoC development, although judging by the following paragraph on page 35 (Priorities for Guiding Principle 1), you may have already thrown in the towel?

"T/PR1c: That Boughton and Dunkirk Parish Councils play an active role in the preparation and implementation of a design and development brief for the Duchy Land in respect of traffic and pedestrian routes."

A constructive and sensible plan for the future.

I think the people behind this have worked incredibly hard to bring this to fruition. I hope that they are recognised for their dedication and service to the communities of Boughton and Dunkirk.

Well prepared and I commend to the villages.

Firstly, I would like to thank, and congratulate, the team that have obviously worked very hard to put together this comprehensive plan. I'm not sure whether this is really a plan comment, but I notice that Dunkirk has gained consent for an S106 planning condition, which I think is excellent - is Boughton also going to try and gain this condition?

If this plan can be upheld that would be great - although fierce opposition to the Dutchy land and Winterbourne Fields plans should be ongoing. Both will only create further congestion on our local roads and lanes - The Street will be gridlocked and Boughton Hill will become like a racetrack with nobody able to turn out of their drives. As much as any Council wishes/plans for folk to travel by public transport, everybody still jumps in the car when needing to go somewhere.

## Email comments

EMAIL	NP ACKNOWLEDGEMENT / RESPONSE
<p>I have read through your plan on the links below, I would like to add something to that plan. You have mentioned the parking in The Street and I would agree that it needs looking at, however I live in Poplar View and we have an issue with parking too. It seems that quite often we get forgotten about because of where we are located, is it possible for you to look at this in your neighbourhood plan?</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comments on the draft Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan. We will take all comments from local residents into account during the consultation period which lasts until 14th May 2021. In the meantime, we would also encourage you to submit a formal response form, which can be found on our website at <a href="http://www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk">www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk</a>.</p>
<p>I just wanted to say, that having read through the whole of the Neighbourhood plan yesterday morning (a solid 2 hours), I am really impressed with it - for its clarity and sensible approach to the planning issues.</p> <p>I am so gladdened to know we have such able and willing members, protecting our village for the benefit of us all. Great work.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your kind comments on the draft Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan. We would also encourage you to submit a formal response form, which can be found on our website at <a href="http://www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk">www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>We will consider all comments received during the consultation period which lasts until 14th May 2021.</p>
<p>I was concerned to read in the latest Swale Local Plan of proposals to build 20 dwellings at the former Garden Hotel, Boughton.</p> <p>I note that this does not feature in the list of recommended sites included in the newly released Neighbourhood Plan. (By the same token those</p>	<p>i]</p> <p>Thank you very much for your comments on the draft Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan. We will consider all comments received during the consultation period which lasts until 14th May 2021. However, I will ask a member of the group to contact you to address your specific concerns.</p> <p>In the meantime, we would also encourage you to submit a formal response form, which can be found on our website at <a href="http://www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk">www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk</a>.</p>

that you refer to - in Bull Lane and Colonels Lane - are not mentioned in the Local Plan).

Can you explain this discrepancy? Would the Parish Council be in favour of such a development and more importantly has it any power to prevent it should the Local Plan in its current form be adopted?

Clearly this particular listed building has been in a critical condition for some time and is in urgent need of attention. (Indeed I'm surprised the Council hasn't subjected it to a compulsory purchase order long before now).

However, what is being proposed here is a disproportionately large estate. Due to its location, it flies in the face of your stated aim to only permit developments which 'minimise additional traffic...through The Street'.

Indeed, in view of the precarious nature of vehicular access onto The Street from the site - whether through the archway or via the entrance to the Wesleyan chapel - it would surely be unfeasible to allow anything beyond a small number of units (primarily from the conversion of the hotel building itself). How it would be possible to obtain access for all the construction traffic - heavy plant etc is another story...

I live nearby and can confirm that this area of scrubland running down to the A2 is rich in wildlife

ii]

I'm one of the team who put together the Neighbourhood Plan for consultation, and can't speak for the Parish Council, but hope to explain our thinking.

Thank you for the points you raised about the Garden Hotel, which equally concern us – and a lot of people. There have as you may know been a number of proposals to bring the building back into use, including a proposal for 10 dwellings which received planning permission but was not implemented and has now expired. It involved access alongside the former Wesleyan Chapel, and had car parking and landscaping at the rear.

We understand that the Borough Council planners have been in discussion with another developer about a scheme aimed at making restoration and re-use a viable proposition, although neither we nor the Parish Council have been privy to their deliberations.

We can only assume that the inclusion of 20 dwellings here – and the proposal to extend the village envelope to include more land at the rear – has come about as a result of these so far private negotiations. We have already made our views known, opposing the extension of the village envelope on to land down to the stream which we had identified as part of the green setting of the Conservation Area, and had not identified the site for further development. It is, as you say, rich in wildlife.

Of course, any planning application for a larger number of units would have to be considered on its own merits, but clearly the specific inclusion of 20 dwellings - and the extension of the village envelope - in the Local Plan would make it more difficult to resist. Such an application would be determined by the Borough Council; the Parish Council would be a consultee.

One of the starting points of any Neighbourhood Plan is that it has to work within the approved Local Plan for the area, and only add to it. As to the sites at Bull Lane and Colonels Lane, these were included in the old Local Plan and are carried forward in the review – like a lot of things in Swale's website you have to look hard to find it, but they are referred to and included in Appendix 2.



(with nightingales in spring) and as such provides a much-needed buffer zone against the attendant pollution/noise of the motorway.  
I'd be interested to hear what the Parish Council has to say on this matter. As is evident from the Local Plan, all Swale BC is concerned about, it would appear, is making up the numbers.

I have recently received your letter regarding your so-called 'Neighbourhood Plan' for Boughton, Dunkirk and the surrounding areas. I think the very idea of imposing more homes on an area renowned for its natural beauty is despicable. The very notion of placing even more homes in a place already enamoured by a bulk of developments lends credence to the idea these houses are being so-called 'planned' without any proper insight into the areas that will be affected by them.  
Kent, I will remind you, is called 'The Garden of England'. It is known for its areas of outstanding natural beauty. You consistently shoving housing development after housing development in there not only destroys the natural wild habits but also adds to the ever-looming threat of the climate crisis. Which seems to be forgotten about in favour of bottom-line profits.  
There is no doubt in mind that most houses will be snapped up by richer members of society and sold

Thank you for contacting us.  
I have read your email and believe you are confusing the Neighbourhood Plan with Swale's Local Plan Review.  
Whilst a neighbourhood plan **IS** a development-led plan, you will note that we are only proposing up to 12 houses (these would be subject to a planning application) which are based on the information given to us by people in both Parishes.  
The Plan is designed to encompass the values of the villagers and propose design codes and appropriate restrictions to any planning applications that come forward (something no-one can control - you yourself might apply for a quantity of housing next week - we do not know, but the NP would impose quality standards on anything proposed). The final decision on anyone gaining planning permission of course also lies with the LPA - Swale Borough Council.  
The Swale Local Plan Review is **proposing** up to 10,000 across the Borough, including (locally) 90 at Selling, 20 at the Garden Hotel, 2,500 + commercial at Brenley (known as the Duchy Land), up to 1,000 on land East of Love Lane (in Graveney) plus others across the Borough.  
Dunkirk Parish Council is holding an open meeting, zoom, on Tuesday 6th April with guest speaker Jill Peet who is the lead officer for Swale's review. I suggest if you listen in you could ask any specific questions directly to her.

for extortionate amounts of money. -Further perpetuating the problems these are causing. Of those few who are genuinely moving into these properties with no drive other than the purpose they were built for, they are moving to this area to get away from such housing developments.

I believe serious consideration should be taken by the government at large to adjust these numbers and find better solutions to the housing issue. In failing to do so there will be no natural garden left in England not torn apart for profiteering purposes.

If you genuinely want to create homes to be affordable to first time buyers like myself (for example) ways of curtailing rich resellers should be taken into account. Perhaps the homes are of a reasonable price and are only available to those of a certain income bracket? Perhaps a restriction is placed on them to deter away resellers such as controls on the resell value not to exceed far above the original asking price?

I'm sure I am not the only member of the boroughs concerned with these environmentally damaging projects. Perhaps to earn favour with the public and make the homes more appealing designate natural green spaces. For example, patches of woodland or fields that are left for wildlife to continue to inhabit. A small field of grass and a tree unnaturally placed there will not do.

I hope this helps, but if you have any further questions, you may telephone me on the number at the bottom of the Neighbourhood Plan leaflet that was hand delivered to your address.

To counter the housing developments perhaps the proposal of total protection of Kent woodlands would help retain Kent's garden of England title. I'd even go so far as to say reconnecting small patches of woods back together.

Ultimately these houses and developments must do their best to incorporate greenery into their designs. They must not consume small rural communities who do not want their community to become a borough of Faversham or Canterbury much in the same way surrounding towns of London were. Perhaps cluster the developments together to create a new village in areas which will not feel the strain on its services. Particular care must also be given to improvement of air quality and vast reductions in carbon emissions as such it would not be unreasonable to request new developments must incorporate green energy and environmentally clean methods and materials in their design.

I hope some of this helps and I thank you for reading.

I have read through the plan and think you have done a good job with outlining the needs of the village to retain a separate identity, and not become a suburb of Faversham, connected by a large number of houses. The point is well made

Thank you very much for your comments on the draft Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan. Your informed remarks in support of the Plan are very much appreciated. We will consider all comments received during the consultation period which lasts until 14th May 2021.

that there are gaps e.g. off Colonels Lane which can be filled in with housing of a more limited nature and suitable for local requirements. I am appalled that Swale think that such a large number of houses are to be built east of Faversham, swallowing up prime agricultural land (especially the Duchy land) which could be better used for growing food. What makes this more ridiculous is that there is no way can the roads cope round here with more traffic; and Brenley roundabout is such a major national hub, to add to congestion there by traffic engendered by 1000's more homes is insane. The provision of schools, medical centres etc has not been thought through, and Swale's ideas need a considerable rethink.

In the meantime, we would also encourage you to submit a formal response form, which can be found on our website at [www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk](http://www.boughtonanddunkirkneighbourhoodplan.org.uk).

Please accept and use my comments on the Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan 2021: Many congratulations to everyone who came together to produce the Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan. It was a pleasure to read the Plan. I consider it to be a tour de force. Everyone involved in bringing it to fruition should be congratulated and feel justly proud of the enormous effort, tenacity and skill required to complete and publish the final document.

Thank you for your email. On behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Group, thank you for taking the time to respond and for your supportive comments.

I am sure that all the long hours, hard work and dogged determination put into research and write the document will be appreciated by everyone who reads it, and by the communities of Boughton under Blean and Dunkirk, on whose behalf it was undertaken in the first place.

There is no doubt that the document has been a massive undertaking, achieved over several years of back-breaking toil by a tenacious and loyal group of local residents, pooling their many areas of expertise and resources, going all out to do their level best to present a robust, accurate and comprehensive representation of their village environs, resulting in an authoritative, definitive plan by which to preserve, protect and prosper their adjoining neighbourhoods for the future.

I would just like to congratulate you all on such a comprehensive detailed plan. Not an easy task. The arguments are well presented, and I would like to add my name to the weight of this document.

You have stressed the need to retain the individuality of these villages and the natural surrounding so important at this time.

I would again like to flag up the present added pressure of trying to push through the enormous development at Dunkirk. Totally unbelievable.

AWAITING DETAILS OF RESPONDEE FROM LOUISE.

The enormous, planned development to Brenley is totally impractical, infrastructure, doctors etc traffic etc. This is supposed to be a time of greening the country and averting temperature rises, we cannot replace grade 1 agricultural land or mature ancient woodlands.

This is an area where people come ie tourists, "garden of England" and yet we do not preserve it. Well done all who have presented this document.

## BOUGHTON AND DUNKIRK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ONLINE & EMAIL CONSULTATION / COMMENTS DATA

Main points mentioned / frequency	Plan Objectives	Housing	Traffic and Transport	Business and Employment	Community Wellbeing, Education, and Health	Environment, Landscape Character, and Design	General comments	Email submissions	TOTALS
No excessive housing developments / limited development*	5	9	3			2	2	1	22
Sustainable development	2						1		3
Retain villages' identity – separate from Faversham	5	2				4			11
Protect the villages' heritage, conservation and countryside*	4	6	1			6	1	1	19
Local resident priority / affordability		3							3
Provision of local amenities including doctors		2	1		5				8
Environmental – traffic pollution			1						1
Village traffic congestion / speed limit reduction / restrictions*			4				2	2	8
Electrical charging points			2						2
Provision of off-street parking including new homes			2						2
Cycle lanes / footpaths maintenance			1		2				3
Promote local businesses / reuse redundant buildings / create new opportunities / new shops				6	1				7
School concerns – size, mobile units, access, future provision					2		1		3

\* majority mentioned in relation to Duchy / Brenley Corner proposed development

## BOUGHTON AND DUNKIRK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ONLINE CONSULTATION

15/03/2021 – 14/05/2021 [29 responses]

<b>1a</b>	Live / work in Boughton	63.3%	<b>1b</b>	Live / work in Dunkirk	36.7%
-----------	-------------------------	-------	-----------	------------------------	-------

### 3 respondents did not live in either parish – not included in 1a & 1b data:

- I. Resident of neighbouring parish [no contact details given]
- II. Landowner [contact details given]
- III. Agent for a Landowner [contact details given – included as a statutory consultee]

Q. nos.	Question	Y %	N %
<b>2</b>	Are you generally in support of the Plan's Objectives?	90	10
<b>3</b>	Are you generally in support of the Housing Policies?	83.3	16.7
<b>4</b>	Are you generally in support of the Traffic and Transport Policies?	93.3	0.7
<b>5</b>	Are you generally in support of the Business and Employment Policies?	90	10
<b>6</b>	Are you generally in support of the Community Wellbeing, Education, and Health Policies?	96.7	0.3
<b>7</b>	Are you generally in support of the Environment, Landscape Character, and Design Policies?	96.7	0.3