

Extract from letter from with Cllr Phil Jones, January 2016:

"...If you think there are additional measures that are within the council's power to deliver then please propose them. In addition to proposing them to me, you will also have opportunity to do so when the draft Local Plan is consulted upon again later this year, and to make your case to the government inspector at public examination as necessary."

Rochester CA response to Local Plan: issues October 2016		
<i>Section</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>C: Camden response R: Rochester reply</i>
1.01	Why the Plan?	C: How the Local Plan differs from current plans is not a soundness matter. R: But it is a coherence matter!
1.02 1.03	Camden Plan	C: Changes Proposed R: Changes welcomed (but LP should also be coherent at 2.07)
1.04	Locational	C: explains locational only and current R: How can LP be meaningful to read in 2020 - wording and maps should not be about pre-2016 situation
1.10	Participation	C: Consultation for Local Plan R: Could LP define better mechanisms for continuing consultation within planning?
1.11	Neighbourhood plans –	C: No problem seen R: What if Neighbourhood Plans and Council level plans disagree?
1.13	Supplementary planning guidance	C: Supplementary, not Development Plan R: Could LP give more support to SPGs?
1.19	Participation (as 1.10)	C: Noted R: Could LP define better mechanisms for continuing consultation within planning
1.21	Responding to impact assessments	C: Inherent in the text R: Could there be heading-by-heading responses like Camden's for the LP consultation?
1.22	Data	C: Existing data sets R: OK
2.03	Predict and provide (what is 'need?')	C: Consistent with London Plan R: Camden could do it better
2.07	Employment	C: Only protecting business premises R: Can premises be integrated with local economy planning?

		C: Uses Camden Plan wording. R: But Camden Plan now outside LP hierarchy – see response to 1.02. LP could do better.
2.08	Location	C: based on ptal assessments R: Crudely but not linearly (eg Maiden Lane estate, doubling is size, is landlocked...). Could Camden give a little more thought to this crucial issue, rather than say 'not possible or appropriate'?
2.17	Density	C: wording revision proposed R: Helpful
2.54	Camden Town	C: Look at ref CD2.7 and CPG5 R: Could Camden give greater attention to the harmful effects of further 'growth' of Camden Market.
2.55	CIP	C: Each phase of CIP will have consultation R: Could there be greater clarification in LP to which future CIPs will aim? 'Consultation' rarely sets out alternative options / objectives for discussion.
6 A2	Fleet	C: No change required R: The Fleet groundwater is not only in sewers. It is an asset under-recognised.
7.1	Character	C: Modification in line with London Plan proposed; accepts concerns about Character Study R: Welcomed; inconsistencies need to be corrected; and need for more collaborative local planning.
8.59-61	Flooding	C: Noted R: This section is significant for basement development proposals and could receive a more active response.

Rochester 6/10/2016