



Medway Council
Planning Department
Gun Wharf
Dock Road
Chatham
Kent, ME4 4TR

17 September 2021

Dear Sir.

Cuxton Parish Council Response to Kentish Wine Vault Planning Application: MC/21/2328

The proposed development has divided opinion in the village as some residents feel that a winery would be good as it is preferable to a housing development, for example. Other residents have stated concern about the location of the development, and the consequences of living near what is to be a large tourist attraction and could expand further in the future.

There are two main reasons why the Parish Council object to this planning application, although there is little doubt that the design of the building is unique and innovative. Other concerns have been included that are also of relevance to this application.

1. The Location

This planning application is for a huge commercial development in Bush Valley, Upper Bush, Cuxton. Bush Valley is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) located within the Green Belt and adjacent to the Conservation Area of Upper Bush. For these reasons alone the application should be refused.

The National Planning Framework Section 13. 149 states:

‘A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt’.

The claim that this development can be exempt because it is an agricultural building is flawed. The proposed building will be primarily a visitor centre, restaurant and café which is a commercial not an agricultural activity.

To meet the criteria for allowing development in an AONB the winery present the proposed development as agricultural: a processing and bottling plant linked with the agricultural nature of the vineyard. The addition of the visitor centre, restaurant and café on the same site is said to be ‘ancillary’ to the processing and bottling plant. This suggests that it is a secondary rather than a crucial element of their business plan. If this is the case, then the visitor centre, restaurant and café should be located elsewhere that is better served by roads and better able to cope with the projected 70,000 visitors/year.

If the visitor centre, restaurant and café were proposed as the primary reason for the development this application would be rejected under AONB and Green Belt regulations. This commercial aspect of the

application is also the one that will cause the most disruption to village life through increased vehicular traffic.

Within the planning application the developer is very dismissive of the draft Medway Local Plan. The Parish Council have been engaged in all the local plan consultations and Bush Valley was not identified as an area for development during any stage of the plan's development. The collaborative work already completed cannot just be dismissed because it does not suit the developers plans.

2. Traffic Congestion

The ambition of KVV is to be the biggest vineyard in the UK with over 70,000 visitors/year, all of whom will pass through the Cuxton village from the junction with the A228 and along Bush Road. The planning application anticipates 300 visitors/day for the wine tours plus the visitors to the restaurant in the evening. The view of the developer that this will have a minimal impact on the traffic flow through the village is hard to accept for those with local knowledge of the traffic flow problems regularly experienced along Bush Road.

Bush Road runs from the A228 up to the proposed access road to the development and will be the main entry and exit route. The A228 itself is a busy road and is used as a link between the M2, A2 and the M20/M26/M25. In addition, the junction with Bush Road has been the centre of ongoing safety concerns for many years that remain unresolved.

Bush Road also has restricted width in three areas: adjacent to the shops, social club and Riggall Court. Traffic congestion is regularly a problem in this section of Bush Road between the shops and the social club, especially at school drop off and pick up times, during supermarket deliveries, and on rubbish collection days. This is clearly illustrated in the Transport Assessment. However, the conclusions of the Transport Assessment: 2.21-2.28 are misleading. The consultants have stated that:

'a weeklong automatic traffic count was undertaken on Bush Road, Cuxton at a location close to the proposed site access and adjacent to the Dean Farm access, between Wednesday 18th September and Tuesday 24th September 2019'.

At the consultation presentation it was clearly stated that the expectation was that all visitors would access the proposed Wine Vault via the A228 and Bush Road and yet the traffic survey contained in the Transport Assessment does not contain any data regarding the traffic already moving along Bush Road between the junction with the A228 and the junction with Charles Drive to the West.

The traffic count was located at the western edge of the village and does not consider any traffic travelling in and out of the village prior to that point. Consequently, it does not include the daily commuter traffic or the 250 cars coming in and out of the village to take children to the school or one of the two nurseries in the village. All this traffic will be competing with traffic going to the proposed Wine Vault. For this reason, the statement that this development "does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads" and "will not harm the rural character or amenity" can be challenged (5.6 and 5.19 respectively, Assessment and Application Proposal).

The school run alone generates at least 840 car movements/day without including the nurseries or those Cuxton parents who drop their children at school by car and then drive to work. When added to commuter and commercial traffic it is possible to understand why residents feel a potential increase of another 200-

300 daily traffic movements to the proposed Wine Vault will result in severe traffic congestion on Bush Road, particularly between the junction with James Road and the junction with Charles Drive.

The Transport Assessment has no record of the traffic flowing along Bush Road through the village, and therefore the developer is not able to make a judgement and state that there will not be a significant impact on local roads. There will be a very significant impact on Bush Road traffic flow.

3. Safety

The location of the access road at the point where the Pilgrims Way crosses Bush Road and the lack of any pavement from Tomlin's Lane to the access road and footway to the site raise considerable safety concerns. There is no mention of the risk to health from increased air pollution on Bush Road resulting from the increased traffic congestion. This will be of particular concern during construction when HGVs will be needed to transport building materials to the site.

4. Disruption during Construction

There is a lack of clarity over the level of disruption resulting from the 2year construction period. The underground building is a huge concrete structure that will require many hundreds of concrete deliveries, although at one presentation it was suggested that the concrete will be made on site. Whatever the truth of the matter all the materials needed for construction will travel up and down Bush Road to Bush Valley. This type of HGV movement through the village will be untenable for the village and the disruption caused to the local habitat during construction will doubtless drive away the wildlife that currently inhabit Bush Valley.

5. What Benefit does this development bring to the Cuxton Community?

It is easy to see that the application will be seen as having many benefits for Medway Council in terms of prestige, tourism and employment and their bid for City of Culture, however, it is less clear how it will benefit Cuxton village. Although some local employment would be welcome the benefits to Medway Council and the KVV company are significantly greater than any benefits the village may gain from this development.

If this development proceeds there will be the loss to the village of Bush Valley, an unspoilt AONB, and the addition of a minimum of 300 vehicle movements/day through the centre of the village.

The Parish Council believe that this application should not be approved as it does not meet the criteria for a development in the Green Belt or in an AONB because of its size and commercial nature. It may also set a precedent for building on other local AONB or Green Belt in and around Cuxton.

If this development is approved, it will result in traffic congestion on Bush Road that will have a significant negative impact on the health and daily life of village residents.

A summary of the views of residents received by the Parish Council are appended to this letter.

Yours faithfully

June Nicholson

Clerk/RFO

Cuxton Parish Council

Concern	Details	From
Consultation	Unclear how many residents attended the webinar. Some residents attended both.	1
	Residents have approached members of the Parish Council concerned about the difficulty in gaining information and contributing to the consultation if you do not have internet access. This is an area of concern.	CPC
	The timing of the webinars not very convenient for those coming home from work or with young families.	1
	Comments that not all questions were answered satisfactorily	6
	Village leafleted with an information leaflet but limited opportunity for those without internet access to engage with the consultation	1
	Despite the expressed concern for local residents, no attempt was made to circulate information to people without internet access. I raised this issue at the time and was told that I could send Kentish Wine Vaults (KVV) contact details of residents without internet access. My partner spoke to two residents in this position, who asked us to send their details to KVV and they were sent details by post. Does the Parish Council have any idea of the number of residents without internet access? Has Cuxton Library been sent information for residents to view or collect? I believe that KVV should be doing more to make contact with all local residents and I hope you will raise this issue before they submit their Planning Application.	3
	I attended the recent consultation meeting on the 1st of July and submitted a question about CO2 emissions. The response from the planning representative was that by merely planting a few extra trees would offset this increase in CO2 emission. I am now wiser as to this simplistic brush off in that simply planting a few extra trees negates the extra CO2 discharged into our atmosphere, having read an article on the subject to which I provide a link below. It seems that extra tree planting is not a silver bullet solution. The only way to maintain carbon neutrality, just as I thought, is to capture it and sequester it into the ground. Carbon sequestration is an industrial process typically associated with fossil-fueled power stations. I wanted to point this out because I would not want this important ecological issue to be brushed aside with simplistic magic bullet proposals by a company whose primary goal is to make the owners richer.	8
During the presentation, we were informed that the KVV's development would be the largest single vineyard in the UK. They presented a wealth of data to prove that there would be little impact on Cuxton village and its residents, but how can this size vineyard not impact on local residents?	3	
Location	I cannot see how it can possibly be a positive step for Cuxton. It would certainly change the nature of the village forever and the site that has been chosen for the visitor centre is particularly unfortunate. As you know, it is surrounded by SSSI areas of woodland, is an AONB and Upper Bush is, of course, a Conservation Area. The peace and quiet, which is such an asset to the area, would be ruined forever by such a major development with a constant flow of visitors to its cafe, facilities and even a restaurant which would apparently be open until 11 pm.	1
	This is taken from the National Planning Policy and Framework (AONB): The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development	7
	As I understand it the winery refers to Medway as being the area where they have the most land under vines yet as I see and understand it the majority of their land falls within Luddesdown and therefore comes under Gravesham. I believe that they only acquired Upper Bush Farm which consisted of c300 acres of which only c200 acres at most are currently being used	9
	Overall I may sound negative but this project is not in keeping with the landscape and it seems to me that while they make all the right noises for getting development it would have a negative impact on our local area of which we are so proud of.	9
	It is a major intervention into the rural setting of Bush valley, which has statutory designations (AONB and Greenbelt), and which has always been a remote and peaceful place framed by woodland that is a haven for flora and fauna. Such locations are precious, increasingly under threat, and need to be carefully looked after.	2
	Cuxton enjoys an advantageous location with its toes in the urban fringe but its body standing otherwise in the countryside, in the corner of an extensive triangle of rural Kent between the A228, the A2 and the M20, one that is uninterrupted by any major development. It is a popular village, while the nearby hamlets of Upper and Lower Bush are Kentish gems in their own right. People choose to live in Cuxton and Bush for this rural edge location and the Kentish Wine Vault will undoubtedly affect that, and the place will change.	2
	We anticipate – but are happy to be corrected – that most of the seasonal jobs will be for labour coming from abroad, or at least from afar in Britain, as with the planting of the vines that has already been done. We would like to know where these 300 people will be accommodated: this needs to be articulated as part and parcel of the project as it could have a further, and considerable effect locally. It would be very unpopular to see a large 'container village' pop up in the area, especially e.g. in the farm yard at Upper Bush inside the Conservation Area.	2
	KVV expect the winery to have an active life of between 25 and 30 years. Due to my age, I don't expect to be personally inconvenienced over this length of time, but I am concerned about the effects on the village I moved into 8 years ago and that I have come to value very much for its quiet and friendly environment. I know I am not alone in valuing these advantages of our village. Is the Parish Council intending to hold consultation meetings in the village to ascertain the views of all our residents or to conduct a survey of residents' views? My partner and I would be happy to help with the distribution of any Parish Council leaflets regarding the winery to Bush Road residents	3

	Introduce unwanted atmospheric (carbon dioxide) and light pollution contrary to the intent of green belt land, place impractical demands on offsite parking and negatively and permanently affect local wildlife and flora	8
	Their knowledge of vines seems somewhat short when looking at the team's c/vs, which does not bode well for a business that wishes to be a lead in UK wine making. At the present time the land under their ownership is not being looked after, you only have to look at the vines to see that they are being choked by weeds, while the surroundings are not cared for. This not only applies to Upper Bush but also to Luddesdown. The boundary fencing is very poor and generally shoddy. It	9
	The addition of a café, restaurant, shop and carpark only makes the proposal worse and is completely unnecessary for the production of the wine. These ancillary activities should be located in a town centre which would be easily accessible and help the regeneration of the high street. Thus, protecting the countryside as the infrastructure is already there	7
	Overall I may sound negative but this project is not in keeping with the landscape and it seems to me that while they make all the right noises for getting development it would have a negative impact on our local area of which we are so proud of.	9
	We are astonished that so many vines have been planted and we are only now seeing application for planning a permanent centre in such a tricky location: it is almost as if it is an afterthought, which does not inspire confidence. The future of the farmyard at Upper Bush remains unknown and the answers received at the webinars are unsatisfactory at best and evasive at worst: 'our plans for the farm are fluid'; 'storage of tractors, machinery, and supplies'. We remain unconvinced that there are not, or that there will not be, other plans for the farmyard. There is a high potential that, because of the status of the proposed main building, people will be attracted just to come and have a look at it. With booked visits only to the car park, we believe that people will park elsewhere – in Lower Bush and on the unsuitable roadside verges leading up to, and including Upper Bush, from where it is a short walk to be able to look at the site from the North Downs Way. Some restrictions would be needed, measures which could be harmful in themselves by 'urbanising' a lovely rural location.	2
Design	They refer to zero carbon emissions but this would not be the case with the planned visitors that they are hoping this project would attract, with car usage and heavy lorries.	9
	In summary, though we can see that considerable thought has gone into the design of the Kentish Wine Vault, we think it would create more harm than benefit, especially to the local people and the local protected environment. In summary, we think that the Kentish Wine Vault main building is a good design, but in the wrong place.	2
	The design of the Kentish Wine Vault – the main building in Bush valley and its infrastructure: •Have been considered in detail by the proposers, at least as a concept, though much detail is yet to be revealed. •Its visual impact will mainly affect Bush Road, with a new road, car/bus park and pathways. •The main building in Bush valley will have no visual impact from Bush Road, as its aspect is in the opposite direction, looking up and across the valley.	2
Construction	The size and timeframe of the build suggests there will be a need for temporary buildings on site to accommodate site offices, facilities and parking for site workers. Where will these buildings, parking and	CPC
	It was suggested that the concrete would be processed on site and not brought in by tanker. If this is the case what are the plans for the processing plant? Where on the site will the components be stored and processed and what noise pollution will there be during working hours for those living at Upper Bush?	CPC
	It is difficult to see how the impact of the build on the wildlife and habitat of Bush Valley can be moderated against. The installation of bird boxes will be of little use.	CPC
	More detail is required to support the suggestion that all the spoil from the development will be aggregated across the site. The majority of the build is below ground and was a central point in the design presentation, however, this would suggest that a huge amount of subsoil will be generated and details of the volumes and how and where it will be aggregated is needed.	CPC
	Two years construction and the extra traffic through the village will cause issues as the village is busy already with residents using the local shops and 2 primary schools. At school opening and closing times the road is even busier and the increased traffic would be a concern for the children's safety. The A228 and Bush Road do not have the capacity to cope with the extra traffic that will ensue.	7
Parking	KWV mentioned that no car parking spaces will be provided for customers who only use the proposed café. KWV seem to assume that all these people will be Cuxton residents, but I am sure this will not be the case. Where will these people park? On our already overcrowded residential roads. We already have difficulty exiting/entering our drive due to vehicles parked opposite. I would urge the Parish Council to look carefully at this issue too.	3
Facilities	What will the opening hours be for the restaurant?	5
	KWV stated that they expected up to 300 visitors per day and that there would be two pre-booked visitor sessions per day, to be held outside peak village times. This seems to be an underestimate for the largest single vineyard in the UK. It may well be that KWV are expecting this number during the initial stages of opening the visitor centre, but I feel sure that this number is a considerable underestimate of future visitor numbers. I hope the Parish Council will be considering the effects of this application over the long term.	3
	It is unclear what the anticipated numbers of visitors will be when the visitors to the wine tours, restaurant and café are combined. The initial estimate of 300 visitors/day seems to be for the wine tours alone.	CPC
Noise and light pollution	Finally I would add that I am also concerned about the noise and pollution from this 2 year project while the effects on the night sky would be considerable after development as I assume it would be operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week and therefore highly visible which would also have a negative impact on	9

	The access road will then go across the field and up to the proposed site, scaring the landscape permanently. There will therefore be traffic causing pollution, noise and lights all day and into the night as the proposed restaurant will be open until 11pm spoiling the quiet enjoyment of the area of outstanding	7
Access and Egress	A question has already been asked as whether there could be access via the roundabout by Peter's Bridge. Has consideration been given to the possibility of accessing to the rear of the new development adjacent to the lake at Halling? I realise that it would not have the ease of construction of the existing plans but the benefit for the village to have access directly onto the 228 would be enormous. Are there insurmountable problems with this?	5
	The proposed new road will be located directly opposite where the North Downs Way footpath emerges adjacent to the driveway of 202 Bush Road. This footpath is heavily used by walkers and cyclists. They have to cross the lane at this point to join the continuation of the footpath on the other side of the road. The lane narrows at this point and is on a bend. Unfortunately, there has already been a fatality here. The addition of this access road opposite will be dangerous as cars are travelling at speed at this point where the derestriction sign is placed.	7
	I am worried about the impact of the construction work, including the heavy vehicles which would be using Bush Road to build the new access road and car park, as well as the visitor centre itself. Once built, we would then have the increase in vehicles caused by the visitors, most of whom will surely arrive by car. There would also be coaches, as well as the proposed electric buses, and Bush Road is simply not suitable for all of this. There is no pedestrian footpath beyond Mayflower Heights and it is already dangerous at times for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.	1
	Why is all traffic deemed to turn into the new road from the east when cars are going to arrive from the A2/Cobham	5
	Has a second and less satisfactory alternative been considered whereby access for cars could be from the A2 to a different car parking area along Warren Road towards the bottom of Cobhambury Road and an electric shuttle to the centre?. This would avoid much of the increase in traffic through the village. Signs could be put up on the 228 and A2 directing traffic. Aylesford village has such a scheme for coaches to avoid through traffic to The Friars.	5
	The only solutions I can think of that would reduce this increased traffic flow would be to either relocate the car park to a site outside Cuxton village and to bus in visitors from the car park to the visitor centre or to develop a route to the visitor centre from outside Cuxton village. Please can the Parish Council raise these issues with KVV?	3
	The junction onto Bush Road needs careful consideration as it directly affects residents there; there is also a need for good visibility in a place where the road takes a slow bend where visibility is poor and the drop in level from the present field to Bush Road is considerable.	2
Traffic Survey	I am very dubious about the answers they provided about traffic flows. They apparently did some survey work in the west of Bush Road in 2019 near the access to Dean Farm. My suspicion is that their survey may have been limited to the short distance between Rigall Court and the Dean Farm Drive. That could give an unrealistically low result as I am sure quite a high proportion of vehicles which come Cuxton from the A 228 and continue west past the schools, turn left off the road into the new houses built on the old "paint factory" site. This means that only relatively low levels travel the short distance which I suspect their survey covered. Comparisons of traffic levels along Bush Rd between the A228 and Charles Drive (east), the A228 and Charles Drive (west) and the A228 and No. 202 Bush Rd, would I believe provide much more accurate information.	4
	They have used traffic survey data on the A228 from a survey done 4 years ago !! Even though it has been" adjusted according to industry standards" it would be much better to have up to date data, in view of its significance to the project and in the light of potential increases in traffic in the area in view of the Lower Thames Crossing project.	4
Traffic 'Flow'	I found it incredible that the company did not appear to have taken into account the impact of the extra traffic on the A228 when this is such a fundamental issue. Neither had they considered the impact on Cobham or Luddesdown (possibly because they claim that no vehicles will travel this way. Obviously, some will). There had also been no consideration of the Lower Thames Crossing which, according to the Noticeboard, is predicted to cause a 20-40% increase in traffic on Bush Road.	1
	You will be very well aware by now of the existing problems of traffic and the concerns of the residents of Cuxton. These are only going to escalate even without this development, due to the huge increase in housing all around this and adjoining areas. The 228 and the A2 are already under severe strain and if there is an incident on either of these roads then Bush Road is used as an alternative and jams happen very quickly. Even on a good day the junction between the 228 and Bush Road is very dangerous being a crossroad and situated at the bottom of two hills and discussions have been going on for many years as to how to relieve this situation. It will only get worse when the new tunnel opens feeding even more traffic onto the A2/Bush Road/228. At school times, on bin collection days and even at Co-Op delivery times it is very difficult to get through the village and to exit Bush Road.	5
	Cuxton is already very busy on Bush Road, with its impossible junction with the A228, which despite the developer's claims – will struggle with the increase in traffic that will result from the project and its 100-space car park on the edge of the village. We see traffic as the most impactful element of the project.	2
	KVV mentioned a survey they had carried out into normal traffic flow through the village but did not answer my question about how and when this survey was undertaken. Due to the Covid restrictions, I'm sure you will agree that, until recently, the volume of traffic through the village reduced considerably. Can the Parish Council ask KVV for detailed information about this survey as this kind of data will be crucial to our understanding of what the actual impact of increased traffic will be. Does Medway Council hold any information that would inform this debate?	3

	The success of incentives can only be guessed at, and people will still have to get to a station. Other public transport, being what it is, does not attract huge numbers and the alternative unless living within walking distance of a station, is to go by car and park at a station which will offset some of the benefit of the price reduction. People intending to purchase bottles or crates of wine are going to arrive by car.	5
	With provision of parking for 90 cars there must be an expectation of a large number of people coming by car. Although it is possible to limit the number of visitors doing tours it will not be possible to limit or gauge how many other visitors are likely to use it to access the restaurant or cafe. There is a distinct lack of parking in the area for walkers. There has been a problem at Cobham where parking was allowed by the land owner but it was so crowded and abused that it had to be stopped. The car park at Ranscombe Farm is frequently full, as is the one on Halfpence Lane. If car parking is available for walkers and site-seers it will definitely generate visits and if not, people will be likely to park on Bush Road which is already a problem, or in the vicinity of Upper Bush	5
	I am also concerned about the effects of increased traffic on the Bush Road/Sundridge Hill junction. I am not aware of any improvement in this situation. 300 visitors each day could produce 600 additional vehicle movements per day, plus delivery vehicle movements. I am unsure whether any changes have been made to the traffic lights to allow easier exit from Bush Road, but increased volumes of traffic will only make this junction more dangerous. Please can the Parish Council continue to discuss this with Highways and	3
	With regard to increased traffic flow, as has been demonstrated in Bristol following the introduction of a vehicle emissions' zone, increased traffic in nearby residential areas has led to an increase in damage to parked vehicles and a marked decrease in property values. I would like the Parish Council to consider these issues very carefully.	3
	Bush Road has 3 road narrowing features and many cars parked on street which in effect makes it a single track road for much of its length. The suggested numbers for additional vehicles using Bush Road are only for scheduled visits and it talks of 'flow' which assumes a constant movement in, out and along the road which is very rarely a possibility because of the above and the difficulty of exiting. There is already a danger to pedestrians beyond Mayflower Heights where there is no pavement. It is also hazardous for horse riders and cyclists.	5
	I am particularly concerned about the increased volume of traffic passing through the village. Whilst agreeing with KVV plans to reduce traffic volume by the use of electric vehicles collecting customers from local train stations, I believe the majority of customers not travelling from London will arrive by car.	3
	With regard to increased traffic flow, as has been demonstrated in Bristol following the introduction of a vehicle emissions' zone, increased traffic in nearby residential areas has led to an increase in damage to parked vehicles and a marked decrease in property values. I would like the Parish Council to consider these issues very carefully.	3
	Even if the planned use of train and electric vehicles reduce the number of vehicles booking on wine tours/tasting, restaurant customers will undoubtedly be traveling by car and with 90 covers x 2 in the evenings there is huge potential for high numbers of car movements all day up until 11pm at night.	CPC
	KVV mentioned a survey they had carried out into normal traffic flow through the village but did not answer my question about how and when this survey was undertaken. Due to the Covid restrictions, I'm sure you will agree that, until recently, the volume of traffic through the village reduced considerably. Can the Parish Council ask KVV for detailed information about this survey as this kind of data will be crucial to our understanding of what the actual impact of increased traffic will be. Does Medway Council hold any information that would inform this debate?	3
	As a concerned local resident, I am against approval of this application on the basis that it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Unduly affect the volume of traffic entering and leaving Bush Road •Increase the likelihood of road traffic accidents along Bush Road and at the already notorious junction with the A228 Cuxton Road •Increase the likelihood of serious injury and/or fatalities because of an increase in RTA's above 	8
	The roads around Cuxton and Cobham struggle to deal with the current volume of traffic and this proposed project will only exacerbate the problem. While the use of heavy lorries at a night time to access the wine vault would be unfair on local residents. It is also highly unlikely that visitors would use the pick up points rather than use their own modes of transport.	9
	As I understand it they discarded the idea of Luddesdown for their wine vault because of the roads and I don't see that Cuxton is available alternative. For a business which prides itself on its professionalism I think they failed to do proper research on the land they were buying and its road network.	9
Economic benefits	The economic benefits of the project lie mainly in the provision of 50-100 permanent jobs and up to 300 seasonal ones, though it remains to be articulated how many of these will be of benefit to local or regional people: we know only that there will be some apprenticeships on offer.	2
	They refer continuously to local labour but at the present time I believe only 2 employees come from Medway and I don't believe that this will alter significantly.	9
Water demands & water management	I am wondering if the Parish Council have had any information regarding demands for water and waste water management. In spite of heavy sporadic rainfall, underground water levels are still depleted in many areas especially on chalk.	5