

Dreamland Planning Brief Questionnaire results

Q1 Please state how strongly you either agree or disagree with Thanet District Council's Planning Brief. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 34.4%
Agree 30.8%
Neither agree nor disagree 15.0%
Disagree..... 11.9%
Strongly disagree 6.2%

2. Please state how strongly you either agree or disagree with each of the following proposals as outlined in the Planning Brief:

Q2a Retention and refurbishment of the Dreamland Cinema building for leisure uses that could include conference facilities. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 53.3%
Agree 32.6%
Neither agree nor disagree 6.2%
Disagree..... 4.8%
Strongly disagree 3.1%

Q2b Keeping the Scenic Railway. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 85.5%
Agree 6.6%
Neither agree nor disagree 1.8%
Disagree..... 2.2%
Strongly disagree 4.0%

Q2c An amusement park on the existing park area around the Scenic Railway, which must cover more than 50% of the site area. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 75.8%
Agree 11.9%
Neither agree nor disagree 2.6%
Disagree..... 6.2%
Strongly disagree 3.5%

Q2d Bars, restaurants and specialist shops within the park. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 35.2%
Agree 36.1%
Neither agree nor disagree 12.8%
Disagree..... 7.5%
Strongly disagree 8.4%

Q2e Provision of a 250 space public car park. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 34.8%
Agree 37.9%
Neither agree nor disagree 13.7%
Disagree..... 5.7%
Strongly disagree 7.0%

Q2f Associated enabling development, including a mix of family homes and apartments. Please tick one box only.

Strongly agree..... 11.5%
Agree 16.7%
Neither agree nor disagree 16.3%
Disagree..... 20.3%
Strongly disagree 34.8%

The Main Issues Raised in Comments in Questionnaire Responses to Consultation on the Draft Dreamland Brief.

The Amusement Park

30 replies agreed with the retention of an amusement park
13 replies felt a Heritage amusement park was a good idea
13 replies specifically referred to the need to make the park an all year round leisure attraction not merely an amusement park
26 replies wanted a park of greater than 50% of the site, the vast majority of that number wanted the whole site retained as an amusement park
4 replies did not want an amusement park
3 replies did not consider an amusement park sustainable
1 comment considered a Heritage park a cheap option that would not work
1 commented that a park should not be just for teenage use
3 replies were concerned that houses were proposed too close for the park and would have poor amenities
3 replies commented that they wanted an attraction on the site as soon as possible
1 reply considered the park needed modernising
1 reply did not want the car park as part of the 50% amusement park area
1 reply said Margate needed Dreamland to recover
1 reply wanted the viability of the park proposal investigated

Response: There is significant support for an amusement park which is reflected in the brief. Research has been undertaken that confirms the high cost of providing a high quality amusement park including the retention of the Scenic Railway and Cinema and ensuring its continued operation. To cover these costs and ensure a viable scheme enabling development, including housing is considered necessary This is now explained more clearly in the brief. The request for an all year round park for catering for all will be included in the brief.

Attractions in (or instead of) the Park

14 replies wanted an ice skating or roller skating rink
5 replies wanted a swimming pool
2 replies wanted a sea life centre
1 reply wanted an archaeological centre
2 replies wanted no arcades
1 reply wanted arcades retained
1 reply wanted a second Eden project
1 reply wanted to reintroduce live entertainment

Response: The brief does not specify what facilities should be included in the park. There is the potential for all of the listed amusement related proposals to be included within the site.

The Scenic Railway

9 replies wanted to keep the Scenic Railway
2 replies wanted the Scenic Railway removed
4 replies referred to the statutory duty to retain the Scenic railway

Response: There is a statutory requirement to keep the scenic railway which is identified as the focal point of the amusement park in the brief.

The Cinema

- 8 replies wanted the Cinema retained
- 2 replies specifically request the Cinemas restoration
- 2 replies wanted the restoration of the Compton Organ for concerts
- 1 reply wanted it used as a conference centre
- 2 replies did not want conference facilities
- 1 reply suggested the Cinema be replaced with a discotheque

Response: The cinema is listed and must be retained. It has a large floor area and its beneficial reuse in a form that retains its character and compliments both the amusement park and other venues in Margate is an important element of the scheme. This aspiration is reflected in the brief.

Other Development

- 5 welcomed shops
- 5 welcomed good bars and restaurants
- 7 did not want shops and felt existing empty units should be refurbished
- 5 said shops should be kept to the High Street or Arlington House
- 4 did not want bars
- 1 reply felt efforts should concentrate on improving facilities in the town
- 3 replies did not think shops and bars alone would attract more people
- 1 reply wanted a new supermarket
- 2 replies wanted green areas within the park
- 1 reply commented that limited enabling development is acceptable
- 3 replies requested a hotel on the site

Response: The brief refers to specialist ancillary retail within the park. Any retail, including food and drink uses would need to be justified through sequential test assessment as required in PPS 6 'Planning for Town Centres' which would consider impact upon the town centre, this requirement is now included in the brief. Licensing laws would cover operational issues

Housing Development

- 20 replies wanted no more houses or apartments
- 1 reply was concerned additional houses would stretch schools and healthcare facilities
- 1 reply felt the balance of housing and leisure was about right
- 1 reply felt some housing was OK
- 1 reply commented housing was needed
- 1 reply expressed concern that the park would shut after houses had been built
- 1 reply requested that some of the housing should be affordable
- 1 reply requested that housing is upmarket
- 2 replies asked that the amount of housing be limited

Response: As explained in the brief an element of enabling development, including housing, is considered necessary to ensure development proposals can provide a viable amusement park. An economic viability test will identify the level of housing and contribution made by the enabling development towards the provision and operation of the park.

Arlington

- 8 replies wanted Arlington flats improved
- 6 replies wanted to pull down Arlington
- 2 replies said renovate Arlington car park to serve the amusement park
- 2 replies suggested building complimentary smaller towers to help Arlington blend in
- 1 reply said remove Arlington retail

Response: The need to improve Arlington House is acknowledged, however it is not covered by specific policies and any proposals for the site can only be aspirations. Discussion with the long leaseholders will continue with a view to achieving improvements.

Transport, Access and Parking

2 replies want the seafront pedestrianised
2 replies request better access between Dreamland and the beach
1 reply said better pedestrian access is a good idea
1 reply considered building a relief road to be vital
1 reply was concerned at traffic increases in All Saints Avenue
2 replies were concerned over increased traffic in Eaton Road
1 reply wanted sufficient parking provision
1 reply considered there no need for extra parking
1 reply wanted better rail links

Response: The brief identifies the need for improvements including pedestrian priority along the seafront and a new relief road. Detailed proposals will need to take account of the impact upon All Saints Avenue and Eaton Road, this concern is now referred to in the brief.

General Comments

3 replies expressed concern over flood risk potential
1 reply wanted peoples living conditions needed improvement, not the scheme
4 replies felt Margate needed to compete better with its neighbours in attracting visitors
1 reply considered Margate depressing and derelict
1 reply considered Margate should give up on tourism
1 reply wanted the decline halted
2 replies wanted the High Street refurbished
1 reply requested the pier be rebuilt
1 reply said cancel Turner and use the money on a theme park
2 replies encouraged tourism and requested a campaign
1 reply said use CPO powers to acquire the site and adjacent areas

Response

- *Flood risk is covered in the brief*
- *The need to improve and market the town is recognised and is being addressed through the Margate Renewal Partnership*
- *It is hoped to address comprehensive development issues through negotiation*

Summary of Comments Received upon Dreamland Brief, Response to First Draft & Responses to Comments

Statutory Consultee Responses

Natural England

Reference should be made to the SPA and Ramsar site, the beach is within the designations.

The potential impact of the development upon turnstones of the development and its in combination impact with other developments within the locality must be taken into account and referred to in the Environmental Issues part of the brief (see guidance in circular 6/2005)

PPS 9 requires maximisation of opportunities to build in biodiversity as part of good design, providing green infrastructure to deliver a sustainable community. A strategy for green infrastructure should be a requirement.

Response: Inclusion of issues raised within brief

Southern Water Services

There is a need to determine if there is adequate capacity in the existing sewer and water distribution system. The developer will need to submit capacity checks. Development should not take place until infrastructure with adequate capacity is provided. Formal requisition procedures are set out in the Water Industry Act 1991.

The layout must take account of existing sewers crossing the site, any required diversions to be undertaken at the developer's expense. Surface water must be separated from the foul system.

Mitigation and avoidance measures to prevent inundation of the sewerage system will be required in areas at risk of flooding.

Response: Inclusion of issues raised in brief

Network Rail

Network Rail request the opportunity to discuss possible mutual aspirations for development opportunities and welcome any potential improvement to stations and other minor infrastructure improvements.

Response: Inclusion of request in brief

English Heritage

English Heritage refer to their comments with regard to the site during the Local Plan process. A character analysis is considered important to inform the brief.

In the policy section they request that reference is made to PPG 15, Manual for Streets, Streets for All (English Heritage), Paving the Way (CABE).

They suggest that a public realm strategy including a management policy to create pedestrian friendly streets and active edges should form part of site and connectivity proposals.

In the Constraints section they request rewording of the bullet point relating to listed buildings and conservation areas, with reference to character and setting being enhanced and reinforced.

They request consideration be given to the presentation and public face of Hall by the Sea Road.

They point out the need to refer to the need to encourage the need to use other modes of transport to the private car in the context of the car park provision.

They recommend a distinction is drawn between primary road network and pedestrian orientated streets and refer to the GEHL study of Brighton which established principles for street hierarchies.

As well as “Secured by Design” they request reference to “Design in Context” (English Heritage).

They request the scope of the EIA include an explanation of the scheme responds to the context of the site covering:

Street pattern, grain, street width/building height ratios, topography, scale, mass, rhythm, design, interface between old and new development and between different heights of buildings.

The identification and treatment of key views and heritage assets should also be included.

Response

- *inclusion of reference to public realm commission presently being commissioned*
- *inclusion of reference to character analysis context*
- *inclusion of reference to supporting policy and guidance documents*
- *reconsideration of access proposals*
- *reference to urban design context in EIA requirements*

Kent Police

The design and access statement supporting any application should cover crime prevention, public safety and crime surveys. It is pointed out that Margate Central Ward, within which the site is located, has the highest recorded crime rate in Kent. The police request pre-application discussion to address crime issues.

It is requested that the car park should achieve “Safer Park Mark Scheme” accreditation.

Reference is made to policy D1, 2 (H) of the Local Plan which specifically relates to preventing crime and disorder and promoting public safety and security

Response: inclusion of main points raised in brief

SEERA

No comments.

Response: No changes required

Kent Highways

Confirm that the brief incorporates what they have asked for and have no further comments.

Response: No changes required

Kent County Council Public Rights of Way

No comments at this stage.

Response: No changes required to brief

Environmental Health (Contamination)

Based upon present knowledge of the history of the site and adjacent sites it is considered prudent that potential developers carry out a contaminated land investigation. Relevant conditions would need to be imposed upon any planning permission.

Response: The need for a contamination study is referred to in the text

Theatres Trust

The trust supports the brief and requests the brief includes a requirement for a needs and impact assessment to be undertaken for the proposed use. They are keen that the building is returned to a sympathetic use but are concerned at the possible impact upon other cultural facilities in the town, i.e. the Winter Gardens and Theatre Royal. They suggest reference is made to new English Heritage guidance on enabling development.

Response: Reference to be made to a needs and impact survey in the brief

Stakeholder Consultees

Save Dreamland Campaign

They request a more detailed explanation of policy in relation to listed buildings within the policy context.

They query the prominence given to the Margate Masterplan as it has no policy status and was not amended following critical consultation

It is stressed that as a minimum requirement more than half of the site must be retained as an amusement park as defined in part 28 of schedule 2 to the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended), they acknowledge that this area can include the cinema, due to its strong historic and functional relationship with the amusement park.

There is concern that, to avoid ambiguity and stress the tourist and amusement destination value of the site, the text should refer to amusement park destination, rather than using words such as leisure which do not imply a differentiation in facilities from those found in people's home towns.

They request that the constraints section refers to the need to secure the park when it is closed.

They support aspirations for site integration and on site development, but consider the car park should not be within the amusement park, particularly as it is for general town use.

They consider that only specialist **ancillary** retail, food and drink should be permitted in the park, but that there is the opportunity for significant retail development on the remainder of the site as long as it does not undermine the vitality and viability of the town centre.

They stress that the brief should make it clear that section 106 money will be used to fund investment in the park in line with policy T8.

Save Dreamland request they are named as a recommended consultee.

Response

- *Reference to definition of amusement park and rationale for inclusion of Cinema in text*
- *Clarification of status given to Margate Masterplan*
- *Removal of ambiguity relating to amusement park and tourist destination*
- *Reference to need to secure park when closed*
- *Clarification of need for 51% amusement park floorspace coverage excluding car park, clarification of car parking policy referring to wider study*
- *Clarification that only ancillary retail permitted within amusement park*
- *Reference to potential additional retail and leisure on remaining land, subject to sequential and viability tests*
- *Clarification relating to section 106 funding priority to maintain viable amusement park*
- *Addition of save Dreamland to list of consultees*

King Sturge on behalf of Freshwater (Arlington Square long leaseholders)

They acknowledge the merits of preparing a supplementary planning document for Dreamland as there is a policy basis in the Local Plan. They point out that there is no such policy basis for the inclusion of Arlington Square and that the brief must distinguish between Dreamland and other sites, including Arlington Square. They also state that there is no policy basis for the part of the new access road to the south of the Arlington site and that such a new road can only be secured with the cooperation of the owners of the Arlington Square site.

Their detailed comments are that Arlington should be referred to in the brief as surrounding development and that there should be a boundary shown to the site of the brief that excludes Arlington Square.

In terms of the brief they see no policy justification for reference to 50% site coverage of the site by an amusement park.

They consider reference to the Margate Masterplan next to the policy section to be confusing as it has no status and request it is referred to as an annex.

They consider reference to the new road can only be an aspiration, not a requirement and that its provision should be with the cooperation of adjacent owners. The only scope they see for the road provision (which their clients can see the benefit of), would be subject to the appropriate redevelopment of the Arlington Site.

They request that plans detail the existing access to Dreamland and label the Punch and Judy Pub and Dreamland as listed buildings.

They wish reference to Arlington and policy T8 removed and for the site area quoted to exclude Arlington.

They request justification for the size of the car park, which should relate to the needs of the development.

They query the presumption that enabling development is required.

Response

- *Arlington to be referred to as an adjacent site*
- *Clarification that there is no site related policy applicable to the Arlington site*
- *Reference to more than 50% of site as amusement park to remain in brief*
- *Reference to new road to be less descriptive and aspirational. Clarification to be provided in text*
- *Reduced status given to Margate Masterplan*
- *Justification relating to car park to be provided within text*

- *Justification relating to requirement for enabling development to be included*

GL Hearn on behalf of Ticketcard (Interested party)

They support the vision and aims of the brief, but feel it fails to deliver Government and Regional Policy objectives, with no reference to sustainability.

They request these objectives are included in the policy section of the brief. The aim should be to provide a sustainable mixed use community, promote urban regeneration and the efficient use of vacant and underused land.

They argue that the site is well located in relation to the town centre, beach and train station and there is the opportunity for a mix of leisure, retail and tourist based development that will improve the viability and vitality of the town centre.

They request a greater emphasis on a scheme that promotes higher value activity and reduced seasonality with significant levels of residential, retail and leisure uses to create a step change in the town. They request flexibility in terms of levels of floorspace and an expansion of the brief to refer to Arlington and Marine Terrace. They also request a more flexible interpretation of the brief rather than a requirement for more than 50% floorspace for the amusement park.

They consider the requirement for the road to be overly prescriptive, possibly not offering the best solution, and consider it more appropriate to test alternatives through transport assessment.

Response

- *Policy section to be expanded to include national guidance relating to sustainability and mixed use*
- *Reference to aspiration for higher value, less seasonal development as part of development proposal*
- *Clear reference to both Arlington House and Marine Terrace as adjoining sites that would benefit from comprehensive consideration in relation to the Dreamland policy area*
- *No specific reference to quantum floor areas, which will be dictated by urban design and relevant policy parameters. Acceptance that the site is suitable for high density development within those parameters*
- *Inclusion of text relating to potential for a mix of leisure, tourism and retail enabling development subject to sequential and viability tests*
- *Retention of requirement for majority of site to remain in amusement park use*
- *Less prescriptive requirement for new road, clarification of aspiration for road on the basis of transport studies undertaken for central Margate*

Barton Willmore on Behalf of Margate Town Centre Regeneration Company (owners of Dreamland Site)

Barton Willmore have submitted track changes to the brief as proposed amendments. In summary they have raised the following main issues.

They consider the context of policy T8 should be referred to in the purpose of the brief.

They request the aims be refined to include the Councils expectations, guidance for developers, criteria for assessment of proposals in relation to policy T8 the appropriate level of enabling development to ensure the long term sustainability of the Dreamland site.

They consider reference should be made to the contribution the development can make to the economy, wellbeing and rejuvenation of Margate.

It is considered that SE Plan policy is the subject of Secretary of State direction and therefore of limited weight.

They consider Arlington should be excluded from the site and that there should be more flexibility and less reliance upon a 50% threshold for the amusement park.

In terms of achieving a comprehensive road development they request that the Council needs to work with other stakeholder to assist in land assembly to ensure wider regeneration benefits and strategic transport initiatives are secured.

They emphasise the need for section 106 obligations to recognise the primacy of securing funding to ensure a viable scheme.

Response

- *Policy context to be included in purpose of brief*
- *Aims to be expanded to cover assessment criteria and Council expectations*
- *Reference to be made to economic, wellbeing and regeneration benefits*
- *Status of South East Plan to be clarified*
- *Arlington to be treated as an adjacent site*
- *Requirement for the majority of site to remain as amusement park to be retained in brief*
- *Acknowledge need for Council intervention working with other stakeholders to seek to achieve comprehensive development and strategic transport improvements*
- *Clarification of 106 requirements recognising primary need for contribution toward maintenance of amusement park*

Response to Amended Draft Following Completion of Consultation

Statutory Consultees

Southern Water

If the nearest sewer or water main has inadequate capacity the developer must requisition a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity, as defined by Southern Water.

Reference should be made to surface water management including SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems).

The Planning Brief should provide specific guidance to developers to aim for standards of water efficiency in both residential and non residential development.

Implementation of water efficiency measures in both residential and non-residential development, e.g. low flow taps, showers, low flush toilets and water butts.

On site and off site foul water sewers to serve the development should be constructed to adoptable standards.

Response: Some issues raised are too detailed for the Planning Brief, but the general aspirations and parameters are included in the Brief.

SEEDA

Recognise Dreamland is a pivotal element for regeneration of Margate and a balance of leisure and enabling development of a high quality, in design terms and types of uses, will ensure economic viability of the site.

They appreciate the level of flood risk will dictate location and design considerations particularly in relation to residential elements of the site.

Encourage the scheme to be integrated with proposals for Arlington Square to ensure that a cohesive development takes place maximising opportunities for the area.

In terms of enabling development on the site, they would like to see a good mix of residential, with the site large enough for family housing, not just flats and they raise the issue of the provision of affordable housing on the site.

The volume of retail would need to be balanced against other retail in the area.

In terms of leisure they want to know how the Scenic Railway will be treated and how additional leisure on the Dreamland site will relate to Westwood Cross.

They would like to understand how the lighting would work on the site and request improved connectivity between the site and the seafront. A new road to the rear of the site and improved pedestrian access will be a dramatic improvement to the site.

Response: Most issues covered in the brief reference to lighting impact and need for leisure impact assessment included.

The Theatres Trust

Highlight the issue of the Compton/Noterman organ in the Dreamland Cinema because there are no longer any Noterman cinema organs playing and it is the largest original organ installation in the UK.

Response: Compton/Noterman organ referred to within the brief.

South East Regional Design Panel

More insight into the background of Dreamland or its architectural or cultural significance in Margate should be provided. The site is located in a fairly tight urban context and this is also somewhat underplayed in the document.

Independent commercial appraisal is essential to test the aspirations of the Brief. There also needs to be an examination of the feasibility of site subdivision and the quantum of any enabling development.

The construction of a new road, as well as its funding and delivery across different ownerships, needs to be subject to a much wider transport assessments that are not covered by the current brief.

The Brief needs to more far reaching in considering how the redevelopment of adjoining sites outside the existing policy area would impact on the Dreamland site.

Response:

- *Historic context expanded.*
- *Viability appraisals and transport assessment have informed the Brief and will be made available to potential developers.*
- *It is acknowledged that a broader strategy for Margate is required to support the brief. This will be prepared as a separate document.*

Environment Agency

The site lies within a Flood Zone 3a where there is high probability of flood risk, a site specific flood risk assessment will be required. Development proposals must be accompanied by sufficient information to enable a sequential test and exception test as detailed in PPS 25 to be undertaken. An exception test must show the site is on previously developed land, provides wider sustainable benefit to the community. A flood risk assessment must show the development is safe and contribute to an overall reduction in flood risk.

Site development should include specific consideration of the future of Tivoli Brook that runs through the site in relation to improvements to the surface water system to ensure only clean, uncontaminated water enters the surface water system.

It is recommended that precautions are put in place to ensure groundwater protection and that investigations are undertaken to identify if there is on site contamination with appropriate remedial measures put in place if required to both deal with contamination removal and disposal.

Details of surface water drainage, fuel storage and foundations and piling will require approval to prevent contamination.

Response: References to flood risk assessment, contamination and groundwater protection have been expanded.

Kent Police

No further comments or observations.

Response: No changes required.

Stakeholder Consultees

Barton Willmore on behalf of Margate Town Centre Regeneration Company Ltd (owners of the Dreamland Site)

Request clarification that where we refer to the restoration of the Dreamland Entertainment Complex, we are not referring to the structures to the rear of the cinema building.

Can we refer to 51% of the park retained instead of 'more than half'?

It would be helpful to refer to the full title and date of the viability assessment prepared by Locum Consulting.

Can we add in 'and other third parties' as well as 'Save Dreamland'.

Response: Brief amended in relation to comments

King Sturge on behalf of Freshwater

The key issues within the Margate Masterplan section should be re-ordered; the subject of the Planning Brief is Dreamland and as such the issues regarding Arlington should come last.

The brief should acknowledge that it might not be possible to bring forward the Dreamland and Arlington sites together due to different ownerships.

The strengthening of the role of Hall by the Sea Road should not detract pedestrians away from using Marine Terrace as the primary pedestrian route as this would have a detrimental impact on the businesses located on Marine Terrace.

Highway infrastructure and public realm improvements are dealt with sufficiently elsewhere within the brief and should be deleted from the Environmental Issues Section.

In conclusion they are supportive of the revisions to the Dreamland Planning Brief and its development aspirations. They welcome clarification that the Brief does not directly apply to Arlington Square, as there is no planning policy which relates to the site, and that any references to the areas redevelopment and regeneration are the Council's aspirations.

Their client shares the Council's desire to see the development of this site progress and look forward to working with the Council in the future to achieve this.

Response:

- *Brief amended in accordance with comments.*
- *Hall by the Sea Road proposed as service access not an alternative to Marine Terrace.*

GL Hearn on behalf of Ticketcard (interested party)

They would like more specific references to a mixed use scheme including a significant element of residential, retail and leisure development to support a successful and distinct mixed use development.

The site's flood risk, land contamination, infrastructure improvements, environmental constraints and refurbishment of listed buildings and structures are all costly issues to resolve. They suggest that more than 50% of the site would need to be enabling development in order to create a viable amusement park and that the brief should allow greater flexibility in the level of enabling development, without prescribing how much site area can be used.

Response:

- *Reference to need for significant element of enabling development included.*
- *Allowing more than 50% enabling development does not accord with Policy T8 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006.*

Save Dreamland Campaign

Request clarity concerning the car park, that it should not be included within the minimum 50% area of the site retained as amusement park.

Requests clarification on Locum Viability Consultation.

Response:

- *Wording has been added to make it clear a minimum of half the site must be available for an amusement park excluding the car park; it does allow a car park on the site if it meets this criterion.*
- *Locum Viability Consultation clarified in the Brief.*

Key Issues Raised In Workshop Sessions
Dreamland Stakeholder Consultation On Amended Draft
9 November 2007

- Keep a Heritage Theme, within which quality is essential;
- Requirement for further definition;
- Development needed to be economically viable/sustainable;
- Development should have a wide appeal (all age groups);
- There should be 'all year round' facilities;
- There should be inter-seasonal attractions/activities – e.g.: Christmas Markets, etc.
- There is concern after what happens after planning permissions, etc. are granted;
- Would like to see a briefing context to other projects in Margate as a whole;
- Give consideration to local jobs/employment;
- Link Dreamland with other local events - i.e.: the Jazz Festival;
- Development needs to be affordable;
- Need some tourism studies to see what attracts visitors/what they want;
- The natural beauty of Margate should be celebrated;
- Important to consider youth opinion in relation to the development;
- Ecology concerns have been raised at the Saints Conference of Thanet Youth;
- The Environment was one of the main issues raised by youths in Thanet in general;
- Request for an Ice Rink;
- Need a facility that is both day and night useable;
- More reference to sustainability within the Brief;
- Reuse and refurbishment of the cinema is of prime importance;
- There should be some reference to Margate's culture;
- Potential for a link with the cultural theme relating to Mods and Rockers, fashion, music, etc.
- Think about the audience in Margate when determining the function of the site, particularly in relation to the other cultural offer in Margate;
- Connect people and wildlife, running through both the park and enabling development;
- Ensure that enabling development in close proximity to the park does not restrict the ability to provide 24 hour entertainment;
- Clarify within the Brief that the car park is outside the park site;
- It may not be practical to pedestrianise the seafront – consider the impact of the north facing location.

Response: Brief amended to cover aspirations not previously amended