

Statement of the Main Issues raised in Representations made under Regulation 28 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

The Council received 190 properly made representations in response to the Regulation 27 Publication version of the Ashford Town Centre Area Action Plan (ATCAAP), published in March 2009. The main issues raised in those representations are set out in the table below alongside the name of the person or organisation who submitted the representation and the part of the document or policy to which they are referring.

Representation from	Paragraph / Policy	Main Issues raised
Ashford's Future	TC6	<p>Do not feel that Swanton Villas are worthy of retention and would like to see comprehensive development here, on what is a key site in the TC.</p> <p>Unsure about the promotion of a secondary route through the site as it may detract from the existing route and dilute footfall movement.</p>
Ashford's Future	TC3	Reference should be made to the delivery of a cycle/ servicing / secure parking / shower change area here - and the creation of a cycle 'hub' in this part of the Town Centre
Ashford's Future	TC13	Emphasis should be on improving the crossing of the river rather than providing a new one.
Ashford's Future	TC24	<p>Given that an aspiration is to increase travel choice, with the aim of reducing car use and increasing more sustainable methods such as cycling, the Plan shouldn't be deriving cycle spaces as a percentage of car spaces – if anything, the relationship should be inverse rather than a direct proportion.</p> <p>Advocate figures at least double those in the Local Plan i.e. a minimum of four bicycles for the first ten car parking spaces provided and, thereafter, two spaces for every ten car spaces but with the proviso that this minimum will be increased over time to reflect the changes in travel choice.</p> <p>As for new housing, should adopt figures based on those from the Masterplan, i.e. new dwellings to have provision for the adequate storage of cycles as follows: 1 and 2 bedroom flat/house – storage for at least 1 cycle, 3+ bedroom flats/houses – storage for 2+ cycles.</p>

			<p>An Ashford Cycling and Walking Strategy is currently being prepared (KHS/KCC led with Ashford's Future input) which will set out standards agreed between KHS and Ashford's Future and based on national government guidelines. It is likely that the figures set out in this strategy will be based on those given above, not those appearing in the current draft of the TCAAP. AAP should reflect this.</p>
KCC	TC11		<p>KCC oppose the inflexible approach in relation to the (primary) school & buildings. Although they have no plans to re-locate the school, should it come forward, they see no reason the Council should adopt a position of retention of the buildings in the Plan.</p>
KCC	Page table	72	<p>An up-to-date retail floorspace needs assessment is required.</p> <p>There appears to be no evidence to suggest the numbers alluded to in the Plan. This fails to demonstrate how the proposed retail development sits within the strategy for the network of centres and delivery of Ashford's role as a centre for significant change.</p> <p>There is an update for food provision but only a 2003 retail assessment which is now out of date.</p>
KCC	Page table	72	<p>Retail and leisure floorspace should be split into two columns – one for retail and one for leisure. The retail column should then be sub-divided into comparison and convenience goods floorspace.</p>
KCC	TC2 -TC11		<p>The County Council is concerned that the AAP doesn't result in binding commitments to provide community infrastructure before the details of the Cost and Funding delivery plan and the mechanisms for securing developer contributions, have been agreed.</p> <p>The plan needs to make it explicitly clear (and include appropriate cross references to the Infrastructure delivery policies in the core strategy), that delivery partners will not be expected to commit to projects which require infrastructure funding and/ or development contributions, without it having been agreed with those partners that the funding sought is realistic and will be available when required.</p> <p>Please insert new paragraph after para 4.11</p>

		<p>“Proposals for the development of allocated and other sites in Ashford Town Centre will not be permitted unless the infrastructure required to support the development can be identified, agreed and made available at the time when any planning permission will be implemented or as otherwise agreed with the service provider. Where funding is required, including forward funding from partners and developers, the Council will not grant planning permission until such funding is in place or the parties have agreed it will be put in place at the appropriate time”.</p>
KCC	TC6	<p>Retail/Leisure amount is not supported - not a target site in the Town Centre - no evidence to support the amount.</p> <p>Definition for Active Street frontages should be changed to “Frequent doors and windows, few blank walls, narrow frontage buildings giving vertical rhythms to the street scene, articulated facades, bays, porches, welcoming feel, and on occasion lively internal uses visible or spilling out onto the street”. <i>From English Partnerships Urban Design Compendium chapter 5.2 “Animating the Edge”</i></p> <p>Whole site should be of high quality to reflect its setting abutting the Conservation Area, singling out the corner risks diluting the quality</p> <p>The view that the ‘Swanton Villas’ are retained is not correct. They are not on a statutory list. PPG15 sets the criteria for judging retention or demolition of non-listed buildings in a Conservation Area. The quality of the replacement will be important and this must be the starting point. It is therefore unsound to assume their retention without that assessment work being done</p> <p>Providing another well used route via site into Memorial Gardens will conflict with the desire to attract retail and leisure use to Station Road - as it will further dilute the footfall on Station Road.</p>
Mr Hughes	TC10	<p>Objection based on the assumption that Victoria Way is no longer proposed to link up to the Templar Barracks roundabout.</p> <p>Fear that increased traffic congestion in the TC will result from this approach, and that the shared space scheme will become too congested – encouraging</p>

		shoppers to go elsewhere
Stafford Charles & Son	New site	Support the AAP but wish to promote Elwick House as a development site within the Town Centre
Mr Gore –for HM Courts Service	New site	The Magistrates Court should have more prominence within the AAP. Although not in a position to deliver this site for development now, the agents feel it should be referenced as an ‘opportunity site’, as in the Preferred Options report
Mr Gore –for HM Courts Service	TC7	Given the proximity of the Court to this site, reference should be made to the need to respect the operational requirements of the Court
Shire Consulting – for Barclays Bank	TC26 -28	<p>The Plan should not adopt shopping frontage policies. A2 uses offer activity, vibrancy and fall within Part A of the use classes order.</p> <p>PPS6 stipulates that any ‘identified areas’ should be defined with rental levels and yields given consideration – no evidence base to this effect has been submitted to support the AAP approach.</p>
Ashford Town Centre Partnership	TC5	If Vicarage Lane car park is redeveloped, Car Parking to service cultural activities within the Town Centre would not be present - park and walk and park and ride are not adequate
Patrick Gurner – for ING Real Estate Investment Management	TC2	AAP fails to have public transport or SMARTLINK policies. Object that it does not deal with the route of SMARTLINK, which is critical to the success of the sustainable transport plan.
Patrick Gurner – for ING Real Estate Investment Management	Introduction	The AAP is silent on the possible relocation of the Bank Street bus ‘terminus’ to a new bus ‘hub’ in Vicarage Lane. Clarification is needed.
Miss McEntee – Firstplan – for National Grid Property	TC14	<p>National Grid supports the thrust of the draft Policy as the company is keen to see the site come forward for redevelopment.</p> <p>However, National Grid believe that the policy should not specify a maximum height for development because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should be dealt with on design grounds at application stage based on detailed

		<p>assessment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - topography of land (low lying) lends itself to taller building form here; - taller buildings make better use of land; - restrictions could constrain the development potential to deliver the quantum identified for the quarter; - the SOS recently approved the ZED homes appeal proposing 16 storeys in height. <p>Policy refers to development coming forward in a phased manner - until the gas holder is decommissioned. The eastern section can actually come forward for redevelopment as a first phase with the existing gas holder remaining in place, because this part of the site falls outside the relevant PADHI protection zones for residential development.</p> <p>National Grid appreciates the desire to provide a link between the development of the Gasworks Lane site and Victoria Park as an amenity space. However, there is an existing route which should be utilised</p> <p>Provision of a new bridge and pedestrian/cycle route would be dependent upon development taking place on site TC13 (Gasworks Lane) as this is where it would need to be located. They consider that a new footbridge at this location would primarily serve the needs of TC13 rather than site TC14.</p> <p>On this basis, it is considered that the Policy TC14 should not make specific reference to funding for a new footway/cycleway bridge in association with the development of the site.</p> <p>Policy should also make reference to the contamination issues affecting this site. The site at Gasworks Lane will require significant remediation, which will result in abnormal development costs.</p> <p>The removal of the gas holder will result in additional costs and in turn, this will have an impact on the viability of the scheme, costing, deliverability, associated environmental contributions and affordable housing. Request that reference to contamination and the issues relating thereto should be added to the text of the policy.</p>
Ceri Edmonds – Rolfe Judd	TC25	Any requirement to make a contribution towards parking/public transport must meet the tests set out in

Planning		<p>Circular 05/05 (Planning Obligations).</p> <p>Unreasonable to seek payment for additional car parking within the town centre if appropriate levels of car parking can be provided within the scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, account should also be taken of the measures employed within the development to reduce car parking (such as car clubs).</p>
Ceri Edmonds – Rolfe Judd Planning	TC22	<p>Recommend that the Policy specifically encourages the use of other sustainable transport modes - including the introduction of car clubs</p> <p>Policy should also recognise that there may be opportunity to provide development with significantly reduced parking and even 'car free' development.</p>
Ceri Edmonds – Rolfe Judd Planning	TC1	<p>Should be a reference to affordable housing mix and quantum within the Area Action Plan</p> <p>The viability for the level of provision of affordable housing within any future proposals should be considered I.e. the developer should be able to provide an open book assessment (toolkit) of the viability of the development to justify why this is the case. This is particularly important given the current economic climate, and should also take into consideration other development constraints and costs – including associated Brownfield costs</p>
Ceri Edmonds – Rolfe Judd Planning	TC20	<p>Support the potential range of uses the Council will support at the site - including retail, office, residential or leisure uses (or a combination of these uses).</p> <p>However, given the current economic climate, it is important that future policy is pragmatic and not overly rigid. In particular, future policy should not be overly prescriptive in terms of the future mix of uses to be provided at the site and floorspace quantum.</p> <p>Rather, policy should be sufficiently flexible and seek to encourage a viable mix and quantum of development - which takes into account the economics/costs of bringing forward new development in Ashford and the market demand for new floorspace within the town centre.</p> <p>We can confirm our support for the current wording of Policy TC20, subject to the deletion of the reference</p>

		within criterion B to a 'development up to 5 storeys'.
Haskoll (on behalf of Quintain)	TC8	<p>Proposes mix of uses including convenience retail foodstore of 3,252 sq.m, 85 residential units and a 115 bed hotel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - argue that retains an element of employment on the site; - available for development immediately;
Collins & Coward / Taylor Riley (on behalf of Denbay Ltd)	TC16	<p>Object to 'office-led' allocation and suggestion that a business class hotel could be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they claim policy is not deliverable - they seek a 'residential-led' scheme allocation instead - policy is similar to S9 from BLP and that hasn't delivered over last decade. - they believe policy is founded on overstatement of the IPS and domestic train services - they believe there is no demand for a business class hotel and that stations will not be a catalyst for major office growth - they claim there is a market for the residential units they propose.
Boyer Planning (on behalf of Ashford School)	TC17, TC18 and TC29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - seeks allocation of Tannery Lane site for residential-led scheme of 120 units with some commercial floorspace as amend to TC17 - seeks allocation of Mace Field site for residential (100 units) + potential for m/s car park (or its removal from TC18) - seek amendments to Green Corridor boundary or wording.
VLH Assocs (on behalf of the Milton Group)	TC10, TC11	<p>Series of points in relation to alignment and width of Victoria Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alignment moved south affecting more of their land. - query why it needs to be 24m - no basis on highway grounds to 2021.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should allow taller buildings to come forward along Victoria Way - Victoria Way should not just be funded by sites along its length – they argue that Chilmington / other A28 sites should also contribute. <p>Series of technical points here part generated by the current planning application for Victoria Way</p>
Barton Willmore (on behalf of Lakehurst Developments Ltd)	-	<p>Seek allocation of Riverside Business Park site for 100 residential apartments and 200-500 sq.m. commercial floorspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they consider site is deliverable in short term, due to short term leases of existing tenants. - they consider site can provide a flood improvement over existing development there – refer to a FRA but this is not included with rep. - base case on housing land supply shortfall and need for additional deliverable sites due to constraints on most allocated in AAP - also seek phasing of development in AAP though do not indicate how this would be done.
Planning Potential (on behalf of Zed Homes & Bondball Ltd)	TC12 and others	<p>A range of objections to various policies and supporting text. Main features are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AAP policy should be predicated on the approved scheme for the Powergen site, consequently most of the AAP content is flawed and unsound. - there should be no height restriction on development in this location. - the site should not accommodate more than 500 public parking spaces. - the site should accommodate a greater food offer – larger format store offers better competition to out of centre foodstores. - Park Mall is unsuitable for a foodstore on grounds of highway capacity and deliverability - parking standards should be amended for residential and retail – also make distinction between food retail

		<p>and non-food retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - commuted parking payments should not apply to convenience retail - A proposed 'Primary Shopping Area' has been submitted. - site will not come forward without the viable mix / quantum of development in the appeal proposal + larger foodstore.
London Planning Practice (on behalf of Dukelease Properties Ltd)	Various	<p>Seek greater flexibility in AAP to enable retail, especially convenience retail located at Charter House site. Repls object/ cast doubt on suitability of Park Mall / Elwick Place / Vicarage Lane for retail.</p>
Drivers Jonas (on behalf of Pendower Developments Ltd)	TC3 / TC8	<p>Series of objections to TC3 and supporting text seeking more flexibility in the masterplanning process, the nature of the comparison goods retail offer, the inclusion of a hotel as a possible use west of Elwick Square, the likely extent of residential development on the site, the nature of the street frontage and the requirement to contribute to the replacement bridge over the railway.</p> <p>Also object to TC8 by seeking retail and residential allocation there - (in support of Quintain reps for this site).</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC1	<p>Object -</p> <p>Support objective in E) (network of public open spaces) in principle and H (protect and enhance existing green spaces) but objects as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AAP does little to achieve these aims - no detail regarding biodiversity enhancement (within either river corridors or open spaces) - enhancement is limited to cycleways and pedestrian routes - no sign of recommendations of KWT for enhancement having been considered, - no biodiversity or protection for Local Wildlife Site - no green infrastructure to increase permeability for

		<p>wildlife through the built environment</p> <p>As a result of above does not conform to National or Regional policy. Map for each quarter ensuring biodiversity connectivity</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC2 – TC8	<p>These policies do not comply with national or regional policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No reference in the policies to provide green infrastructure. - no routes, corridors or stepping stones mapped for ecology - not in accordance with SE Plan policy NRM5, which requires LPAs to avoid net loss of biodiversity and actively pursue gain. - SE Plan also tasks LPAs with a role in helping natural systems adapt to climate change. - long term management policies and monitoring systems are absent. - SE Plan policy CC8 stresses green infrastructure should be multifunctional and deliver the widest range of linked environmental and social benefits i.e. conserving and enhancing biodiversity; landscape; recreation; water management; social and cultural benefits; individual and community health and well being. This policy (CC8) is especially important in regional hubs where there is a need to enhance existing environmental capacity of an area. <p>Recommend insertion of a clause requiring a multifunctional green infrastructure in the Town Centre core and a map to be prepared for each quarter as part of this.</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC9	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no evidence that the LWS is being protected - no mention of pulling back from the river banks for new development. - plans for a new path beside the banks on the western side of the river and a bridge to the leisure centre may lead to the loss of further habitat with no

			<p>biodiversity gains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not comply with national or regional policy. <p>The Trust recommends a policy requiring a 15m natural habitat from bank top to path with the path outside this area; all hard edging removed from banks if possible and wildlife corridors connecting with other green infrastructure of other quarters. Plus multifunctional green infrastructure as in T2 – T8 above.</p> <p>Suggest 15m margin along river banks</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC10		<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no biodiversity enhancement - green infrastructure needed
Miss Debbie Salmon (on behalf of Kent Wildlife Trust)	TC11		<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - learning link and Victoria Way dissects the quarter and could contain largescale tree planting or roadside nature reserves. - Learning campus could have living roofs - campus grounds could incorporate wildlife habitat
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC10 TC14	–	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no reference to need to provide green infrastructure as in TC2 – TC8 objections.
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC15 TC16	–	<p>Objects but welcomes pulling back from river corridors in International Station Quarter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AS27 LWS not protected - no multifunctional green infrastructure proposed - need to strengthen protection eg set margin - stepping stones <p>Suggest minimum 15m margin and remove hard edging from bank</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent	TC17		<p>Civic Quarter –welcomes plans to retain open</p>

Wildlife Trust		<p>character.</p> <p>Concern that landscaping may be too formal.</p> <p>Recommends wide corridors and stepping stones of natural habitat</p>
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC18 – TC20	<p>Objects - Residential Transition Quarter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no multifunctional green infrastructure proposed - there are opportunities for enhancement even if only stepping stones
Miss Debbie Salmon - Kent Wildlife Trust	TC29	<p>Objects - Green Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy not strong enough or specific enough. - no mention of extension or re-creation of wetlands - no evidence of any biodiversity studies to find out what is needed within Great Stour and East Stour corridors especially in view of increased population and access planned. - Access for people given precedence over wildlife disturbance - Duty under NERC Act 2006 not upheld also SE Plan policy NRM5 - no mitigation for damage to wildlife through increased access. - no increase in habitat creation
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	TC9	<p>Omission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - policy must make reference to a station square/plaza - this square/plaza should be main terminus for all bus services (including park and ride) to enable max connectivity between bus and rail services.
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	(Para 2.1 – 2.3)	<p>Object - to change in emphasis from retail/leisure towards an increase in office space;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it will have consequences for TC1 A, significant effect on town centre (office blocks not previously envisaged here).

		- harm to town centre, not in accordance with paras. 3.10 – 3.11 of Core Strategy.
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Para 2.8	Object to increase in provision of housing over and above that identified in Core Strategy (2,750 instead of 2,500) plus no allowance for windfalls or recent new housing developments. - significant overprovision of housing in AAP - lack of recreation, play area, outdoor sports will be exacerbated. - AAP should include windfall allowance for latter part of plan period and have regard to windfall/completions from 2006 and extant permissions. Utilize surplus for recreation/leisure space
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Para 2.204	Object - A site specific preference is being expressed before there has been any consultation on alternative sites. - loss of green space from blue green grid (further reduction in TC open space). - site specific reference should be removed from AAP - to be consistent with CS should be in Station Quarter not Civic Quarter.
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Para 2.226	Object – inconsistent approach windfall allowance is being made for development other than residential, should be for residential as well.
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Chapter 4	Omission – no phasing or delivery or delivery plan for developments proposed. - should at least be an indicative plan. The demonstration of delivery is a key factor of the LDF
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Introduction	Object – Development 2006 – 2009 needs to be taken into account. Plan period should be amended 2006 – 2021 to correspond with Core Strategy
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent	Chapter 3	Omission – should include a section on priorities given to walking, cycling and public transport links within and

Ashford Committee		<p>to the town centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add a policy indentifying non car proposals discussed in chapter 2. - bus/rail interchange at station - SMARTLINK route should be indentified on proposals map and safeguarded. <p>A section in chapter 3 should give the same priority to non-car modes and give a balance underlying Council's commitment.</p>
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Chapter 3	<p>Omission – needs to be a section in chapter 3 on renewable energy and requirements for Town Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should be a policy for all larger sites to provide a proportion of their energy needs from renewable energy sources (this should be in line with stepped minimum targets in policy NRM13 of S E plan – contribution of 16% from renewables by 2026)
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	Paras 3.87 & 3.88	<p>Omission – not acceptable that AAP does not seek to meet deficiency of recreational space to meet CS3 targets.</p> <p>AAP should be amended by reducing the development proposals and by requiring a greater provision of recreational open space.</p>
Brian Lloyd - CPRE Kent Ashford Committee	TC29	<p>Object –</p> <p>Redraft TC29 to same wording as EN13 and EN14 with a footnote to say that the ABLP policies will be deleted once the green and blue strategy is adopted as SPD</p>
Charles Bain Smith	TC5	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - short sighted to condemn architectural qualities of bingo hall. - AAP not enough emphasis on traditional cultural venues too much emphasis on retail. Not sustainable for the future.
Charles Bain Smith	TC6	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already a fine building on the corner of Elwick Road and Station Road. This should be retained and

		extended if necessary.
Christopher Morley	2.112	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the route of an extended Victoria Way across the railway and through Cobbs Wood, would provide a much needed route from SE to NW Ashford. - Improved linkage of areas either side of the railway line (identified as a barrier elsewhere in the document). - this is the only tenable route and should not be lightly discarded.
Christopher Morley	TC4/TC7	<p>Object – New Library should be in Park Mall site and not its current location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better transport links at Park Mall - higher footfall, more inviting and accessible to those who do not usually use it. Will draw ‘window shoppers’. Ashford Gateway has been successful here. - ample pedestrian areas around Park Mall lend themselves to ‘library events’ street theatre, art music not just a building. - Use library site for ‘city dwellings’ more in keeping with environs.
Keith Brannon	TC3	<p>Omission – not enough emphasis on Elwick Place as a gateway to the TC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - opportunity for iconic development hotel, flats/offices give regional identity to the town - more encouragement needed for a theatre or cultural centre here. - ideal corridor from station to town centre via mono-rail or tramway.
Sean Hanna - Natural England	TC29	<p>Support – but could be strengthened, suggestion:</p> <p>‘...forward on land adjoining the Town Centre Green Corridors shall make a positive contribution to the biodiversity value, setting...’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - also should include a reference to the delivery of the

		Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards and the Ashford Green Blue Grid in this section as developments should be contributing to their provision.
Mrs Sandra Dunn - Kennington Community Forum	Para 2.8	Object - increase in number of dwellings proposed and no allowance for windfalls - number of dwellings should be reduced so that land can be made available to address shortfall in outdoor sports/play facilities.
Mrs Sandra Dunn - Kennington Community Forum	TC15	Omission - bus terminal should be included at train station (in addition to existing town centre bus stops)
Mrs Sandra Dunn - Kennington Community Forum	Para 2.204	Omission - A theatre should be included in the indoor arena or as an addition
Diane Hammond	TC3 (not CS3)	Omission - Southern fringe of Victoria Way is in the floodplain. The Environment Agency will object to development. Not clear how Council will deal with this.
Emily Neighbour - Central Ashford Community Forum.	TC18	Omission - Re development of Ashdown Court, North Street would enhance the environment. This is not mentioned.
Emily Neighbour - Central Ashford Community Forum.	TC14	Omission - Need an additional foot/ cycle bridge across the CTRL by Gasworks Lane, from Victoria Park to Elwick Road rather than enlarge existing one. This would open up better ped/cycle routes from South Ashford.
Emily Neighbour - Central Ashford Community Forum.	TC22	Object - Urge re-consideration of loss of parking from Vicarage Road, coupled with loss of library parking this will make it very difficult for people to attend the town centre churches. Park and Ride not likely to

		operate on Sundays and evenings.
Emily Neighbour - Central Ashford Community Forum.	TC21	Omission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - planned multi storey car parks should not overshadow neighbouring residential properties. - should blend well architecturally and be landscaped. - generous disabled parking should be provided to all key sites e.g. post office, library,
Emily Neighbour -Central Ashford Community Forum.	TC24 (TC1)	Omission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - good strategic plan needed for off road cycle/pedestrian network including cycle parking. - eg Dover Place temporary car park is used as a short cut to the station, this should be made permanent in any future development. - Should be a policy in TC1 to improve cycle and pedestrian routes to make the town more attractive.