

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	1-001		Does not include farming or heritage. noticeable lack of commitment to public open spaces, parks, etc.	These issues are covered in the draft Planning Statement (s.3.2 - Agricultural Zones, s. 4.4 - Heritage Preservation Overlay, s. 3.8 Open Space Zones). More detail will be provided in each Area Plan and reflected in Regulations.	
	1-002		The primary objective of the Plan is to maintain and enhance the economy, society and environment of the Cayman Islands - Raises the question 'what is its secondary objectives'? Should read 'The [only] objective of the plan is to support and enhance EQUALLY the economy, society and environment of the Cayman islands.'	Section 1.6 sets out the primary objective, followed by a set of strategic objectives which contribute to achieve the primary objective.	
	1-003		Sustainable Development also needs to take into account the sustainability of the materials (including disposal) and labour of the development, not just land use, and this needs to be included in your definition if you are serious about moving away from your previous green-washing use of the term Sustainable Development.	Section 5.5.3-4 of the Planning Statement speaks to solid waste. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan.	
	1-004		Also need to include 'socially & aesthetically as well as environmentally appropriate' as an 8th Strategic Objective. (Economically appropriate, i.e., cost effectiveness, will take care of itself.)	Social and aesthetics (design) are reflected throughout the draft Planning Statement.	
FF2	1-005		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF3	1-006		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF4	1-007		The objectives are very vague. None are specific, measurable, or timebound.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES GOALS Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section
FF5	1-008		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	1-009			No Objection	
FF7	1-010		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	1-011			No Objection	
FF9	1-012			No Objection	
FF10	1-013		PUT GENERATIONAL CAYMANIANS BEFORE WEALTHY EXPATS.	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate	
FF11	1-014		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	1-015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	1-016		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	1-017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF15	1-018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	1-019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	1-020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	1-021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	1-022			No Objection	
FF20	1-023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	1-024			No Objection	
FF22	1-025			No Objection	
FF23	1-026			No Objection	
FF24	1-027			No Objection	
FF25	1-028		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF26	1-029		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	1-030		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	1-031			No Objection	
FF29	1-032		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF30	1-033		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	1-034		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	1-035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	1-036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF34	1-037		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	1-038			No Objection	
FF36	1-039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	1-040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	1-041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF39	1-042			No Objection	
FF40	1-043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	1-044		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	1-045		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF43	1-046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF44	1-047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	1-048		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	1-049			No Objection	
FF47	1-050			No Objection	
FF48	1-051		I do not object to having Strategic Objectives, the draft plan MUST include onjectives which aim for sustainable development, however, some of these strategic objectives are at odds with each other and there needs to be a more clear prioritization or explanation of how to resolve conflicts.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF49	1-052			No Objection	
FF50	1-053		Agree to all except increase coastal setbacks and increase the powers of the DOE not water down or touch the conservation act unless enhancing it.	Coastal setbacks will be considered within each Area Plan. Issues relating to National Conservation Act are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-054		No more raping island resources, no retrospective planning permissions (hefty fines instead). Accept EIA recommendations don't fight them. Preserve and enhance what little island identity remains. SMB and SS already ruined beyond repair.	After the fact planning applications are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. EIA processes are also outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The draft Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features.	
FF51	1-055		While I think it sounds like a good idea I don't have faith (from experience) that it is accurate or isn't simply PR with empty words.	As outlined in s.1.2 of the draft Planning Statement, the structure of PlanCayman allows for continuous review and community engagement, providing a more manageable process for the Plan review.	
FF52	1-056			No Objection	
FF53	1-057		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF54	1-058		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	1-059		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	1-060		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	1-061		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	1-062		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	1-063			No Objection	
FF60	1-064			No Objection	
FF61	1-065		There is no strategic objective specific to the major environmental threats to the Cayman Islands and if that is not there the topic will be relegated to the back burner. It also ignores the strategy of ongoing advocacy for legislation amendments in keeping with and designed to facilitate the vision instead of responsive to crises.	As stated in the Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement, "climate resilience - incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies." These mechanisms and strategies are to be created in collaboration with other governmental agencies but the Development Plan is expressing commitment to incorporate such policies when brought forward.	
FF62	1-066			No Objection	
FF63	1-067			No Objection	
FF64	1-068			No Objection	
FF65	1-069		these objectives are designed to promote or accommodate more people on Island. The notion that more people is better is wrong and it in complete contradiction to the notion of sustainability. Buy redesignating land for development the Island puts more pressure on natural resources, utilities and transport.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	1-070		Seven Mile beach is washing away and yet more tourism is blindly deemed a good thing.	Sections 3.7 and 5.7 refer to maintaining natural coastal processes and the need to review coastal setbacks. The Planning Statement also introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay (section 4.6)	
	1-071		The only thing that special dispensation should be made is social / affordable housing	The draft Planning Statement acknowledges the challenge of 'supply and Cost of Housing' (section 2.5) along with the need to provide housing for all income levels (section 3.3).	
FF66	1-072		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF67	1-073		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF68	1-074			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF69	1-075		I am very concerned with item 4, Natural Environment. I live in the Brac [REDACTED]. I own Bluff to sea as does my neighbor in the west of road. There is a proposition/plan to WIDEN this road as well as create a parking lot. The existing road paved in [REDACTED], extended all the way into the iron shore, destroying tidal pools as well as juvenile species. As of the the paving, the SIRI that lived there was run over by a vehicle. Further there was NO reason to pave Juniper Bay. I am the only residence down it, it IS NOT a beach access site, nor a shoreline entry site, nor an area to fish. I have the government's own publications in support of this. The government does what they want, when they want. Please explain to me how the abject destruction of habitat will support the 'Natural Environment'.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritisation of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF70	1-076			No Objection	
FF71	1-077		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	1-078			No Objection	
FF73	1-079			No Objection	
FF74	1-080			No Objection	
FF75	1-081			No Objection	
FF76	1-082		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	1-083		I am a resident, Registered voter of Cayman Brac. My concern is that we are ignoring the lack of infrastructure on Cayman Brac especially concerning our lack of water during dry seasons, (last winter we were rationed to 2000 gallons per delivery due to the current water plant not being able to keep up with the demand. I understand the plans for the past 7 years was to build a new plant , however that has hit numerous speed bumps. As well as the current state of the dump! It is now up to the top of the bluff!!! We should be learning from our sister Island (Grand) and sort out these two and a few other issues before developing mass areas and granting unlimited building permits. One way I suggest to avoid the same pitfalls of Grand, is to limit the number of building permits as we develop our infrastructure.....an easy solution first come first issued at a pace we can control so we do not end up lost in the greed with no green left. Please feel free to contact me anytime~ and I will be happy to help!	The Planning Statement in Section 5.5 speaks to potable water provisions. The Water Authority is a consultee for all Planning applications. If there are specific infrastructure requirements in Cayman Brac these can be considered as part of the Cayman Brac Area Plan, in consultation with infrastructure providers.	
FF78	1-084			No Objection	
FF79	1-085			No Objection	
FF80	1-086			No Objection	
FF81	1-087			No Objection	
FF82	1-088		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	1-089		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	1-090			No Objection	
FF85	1-091		Overgrown Properties that are not being used the owners should be given a fine or pay NRA to clean it up	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF86	1-092			No Objection	
FF87	1-093		I generally agree but think the Plan must also reset the balance with the National Conservation Act. The Natural Environment is just one of the seven objectives to be balanced and is not the primary objective. Part of the Plan Cayman process should be to recommend amendments to the NCA to achieve this outcome.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Issues relating to the NCA are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF88	1-094		I do not object to the broad objectives as they apply to Grand Cayman and to a lesser extent, Cayman Brac. However, I do object to their wholesale application to Little Cayman because of its unique character and the fact that some of the considerations are irrelevant or would be ruinous to the unique character of Little Cayman. Specifically, there is no need for a Transportation plan unless it is to reduce and/or limit the type of vehicles that can be imported. There is no need for an Economic Development plan because the quaint nature of Little Cayman and the fact that modern conveniences are not always available add to its appeal and charm.	Strategic Objectives in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will prioritise objectives through detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response ((Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF89	1-095		Section 1, Background. The basic structure of the plan, including planning zones, overlay zones and other considerations, provides a basis for a comprehensive plan. For Little Cayman, the key section is “Area Plans” (1.4), where for the first time it sets forth that Little Cayman, like other area of the Cayman Islands, should have a plan. What is critical is that the Area Plan for Little Cayman should be developed with input mostly from Little Cayman residents and property owners. Despite its still small size, it should be recognized that Little Cayman now has a large enough population and provides enough economic impact to have an Area Plan developed by those people by and for themselves just as the other areas indicated in Figure 1.2 and consistent with the vision and objectives of sections 1.5 and 1.6.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-096		Little Cayman currently has no plan at all, and development is largely controlled by the Development and Control Board (DCB), which has no Little Cayman representatives and largely represents the development community. This needs to be changed quickly to avoid serious damage, which has been accelerating recently.	Noted. PlanCayman seeks to introduce a specific 'Area Plan' for Little Cayman. The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	1-097		This means Little Cayman should be one of the first Area Zones created and legally enacted.	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	1-098		In the meantime, and in any subsequent state, Department of Environment objections to plans proposed by the DCB should be observed, with formal legal action necessary for the DCB to bypass DoE objections.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	1-099		Section 2, Challenges and Opportunities. Each Area will put different emphasis on the nine factors mentioned in this section, and they will interact in different ways. On Little Cayman, Quality of Natural Environment will be highlighted, and will mean managing development to limit population growth to avoid going beyond the capacity of the island while protecting the environment. That can be done in a way consistent with the plan for the Cayman Islands as a whole; preserving the environment on Little Cayman will preserve its attractions for visitors, helping the economy of the Caymans as a whole. Details of how to protect the Natural Environment are best addressed in specification for Planning Zones (next section).	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF90	1-100			No Objection	
FF91	1-101			No Objection	
FF92	1-102			No Objection	
FF93	1-103			No Objection	
FF94	1-104		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF95	1-105		All the strategic objectives only apply to Grand Cayman. The entire draft planning statement only applies to Grand Cayman. I object to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman being completely left out.	As stated in Section 1.6 - Strategic Objectives of the Planning Statement, "The primary objective of the Plan is to maintain and enhance the economy, society and environment of the <u>Cayman Islands</u> ." The Planning Statement is drafted to incorporate all 3 islands whilst factoring in flexibility, acknowledging that each island will have unique needs. PlanCayman also proposes separate Area Plans for each of the Sister Islands to meet the particular needs of each of those places.	
FF96	1-106			No Objection	
FF97	1-107		On pg. 1.6 (pg. 6) I do not object to the listed Strategic Objectives, but I do believe that something about preserving our cultural heritage or preservation of Caymanians' built heritage (i.e. historic structures) should be included here.	Noted. This suggestion can be incorporated into the Vision (section 1.5)	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: "Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic , social and environmental <u>and economic</u> outcomes, while safeguarding <u>Caymanian Heritage</u> , the culture, and the health and general welfare of its people."
FF98	1-108			No Objection	
FF99	1-109		Generally I am in agreement, but for housing, climate resiliency I think you need more emphasis on more efficient land usage, eg higher densities, more mix of commercial/residential and an overarching goal should be to reduce the high costs of housing, as that is not mentioned. I am concerned the land usage is misguided on large areas for Agriculture in prime areas suited for housing, eg non flood zones.	The Planning Statement supports the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3. Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be discussed at the Area Plan phase and implemented via updating of the planning regulations. In terms of Agriculture, section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural uses, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy.	
FF100	1-110			No Objection	
FF101	1-111			No Objection	
FF102	1-112			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF103	1-113		Whilst these items are listed -they are too vague for any difference to the current practices. The natural environment whilst this is great to see that it is included the track record of this department tells a completely different story even probably as this white paper is written with the several court cases that cost this country huge sums of money, defending the foolishness of a wealthy developer who could have afforded to defend it himself. Without the natural environment, Cayman has nothing for the tourism market to stand out against other competing countries.	The Planning Statement is a high-level document that defines the various Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations. These will be applied, with more detail, in each of the Area Plans.	
	1-114		The failure to protect the natural environment in the past, with vast areas of mangroves being removed in the past 15 years.	The Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features, and also includes the Coastal Mangrove Buffer.	
	1-115		The permission to build within 100 feet of the coastline and allow ground floor habitable living knowing that in the gulf states of the USA, this is banned due to storm surge.	The Planning Statement introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay to control development is highly vulnerable coastal areas and also seeks to review coastal setback requirements, which will be considered during Area Plan preparation.	
	1-116		If sustainable development is going to be key then it will require a sea change to all the practices seen in the majority of the built environment in the Cayman Islands. DoP had a chance to start down this journey in 2016 with the introduction of new building codes and deleted the energy-saving chapter of the code thus meaning buildings are still being constructed without any mandatory requirement of roof insulation despite climate change known from the Middle Ages not a few years ago. Once again profit of developers was put before the needs of the end-users the recurrent costs of wasted energy are the result which is the complete opposite of sustainable development.	Building Codes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement. Section 5.6 (4) of the draft Planning Statement encourages building design to take full advantage of passive solar energy and natural ventilation and section 5.6(7) encourages resilient design as a protective measure against climate change and demand on infrastructure and utilities.	
	1-117		If this is going to be the basis of the future overarching laws for future planning of these islands then much tighter wording is required to protect the environment for future generations over short-term profit of our generation.	Detailed policies will be addressed at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process which will be incorporated in the updated Development and Planning Regulations and Act.	
FF104	1-118		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF105	1-119			No Objection	
FF106	1-120			No Objection	
FF107	1-121		Re: [REDACTED] I have owned Barkers [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] years. It was originally zoned Hotel/Tourism, but several years after purchasing it, the Cayman Islands government incorrectly published it as Public Open Space and did so for well over a decade, which caused us a huge expense to dispute. Then the Government proceeded to acquire [REDACTED], but after many years of negotiation, they decided not to. Only after causing us tens of thousands of dollars and forcing us to accept a down zoning from Hotel/Tourism to a new zoning known as Beach Resort Residential, by spending a lot of time pointing out to us the advantages this zoning had for developing tourist accommodation; did the Government remove Public Open Space and publish it as Beach Resort Residential, a zoning, which we felt was worth much less than Hotel/Tourism. [REDACTED] is directly in front of the break and entry through Barkers Reef. We had an offer to purchase this land from a Caymanian developer. We were told they wanted to put a canal through [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for large ships to enter the North Sound. I explained to the Planning that the Planning Development's Laws and Regulations automatically allow a 10% clearing of mangrove without DOE approval and [REDACTED] is a large L shape parcel with approximately 2000' fronting the North Sound. 10% would allow clearing of 200', which is ample width for a canal. History tells us that a similar cut was made in Port Royal, Jamaica and the land sunk. The tip of Barkers is already very wet and partially under water and with a canal cut through, it could be completely under water. I believe the dredging done in the 1980's to build the land at Kaibo ; should be done at Barkers to save the tip of Barkers and the road that was started at both ends should be completed for a safe and proper access.	Specific issues relating to the Barkers area will be considered as part of the West Bay Area Plan.	
	1-122		We originally bought this land and were encouraged to move here to develop it, by Mr. Jim Bidden, who was the Government Leader of the Cayman Islands. As the years passed, we decided to keep the land for our family. Barkers National Park was proposed and improperly dedicated, but never acquired. The public has been misled that any of the land is a National Park. I'm aware all National Parks have hotels to encourage tourists to share the cultures and experiences found in the park. We've had numerous offers to purchase this land, but my family does not want to sell. We've lived here for [REDACTED] years. My daughter has lived here mostly all her life and her three children, my grandchildren, were born, raised and all live in West Bay. One is with [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED], they are all conscious of the environment and deserve the right to use and benefit from this family land. We want to share in being an instrumental part of Cayman's future.	Specific issues relating to the Barkers area will be considered as part of the West Bay Area Plan.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF108	1-123		Strategic Objective Review Cycle should include a provision for natural local priorities over foreign interests.	Section 1.2 of the draft Planning Statement explains the Development Plan review cycle.	
FF109	1-124		The growing population is clearly flagged as one of the primary challenges and factors guiding the plan, yet any long-term strategy for managing Cayman's population is missing from sustainable development. In the public consultation meetings, it was explained that Cayman is a 'performance based' population whatever that means, and not a planned community. This omission from the Planning Statement highlights the absence of any overarching, long-term plan for the Cayman Islands. While the Planning team will say this beyond their remit, it should be part of Government's to guide the physical development of our islands.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF110	1-125		Transporation: Support ELECTRIC transportation choices and connectivity	Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement, "transportation - Support greater transportation choices that are sustainable for a growing population while being convenient, reliable, safe and accessible." Section 5.4 includes further detail and an amendment is proposed to include reference to Electric Vehicle parking and facilities.	Amend section 5.4 as follows: "Parking Standards 3. Apply parking requirements that appropriately address diverse land uses, unique traffic characteristics and demands; 4. Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes <u>including facilities and infrastructure for Electric Vehicles</u> ;"
	1-126		Climate Resilience: ...in line with the 2015 Paris Agreement	The Cayman Islands is a Contracting Party to various Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). This is referenced in the National Planning Framework (NPF) which remains the overarching basis for all parts of the Development Plan review.	
	1-127		Economic Development:...highlighting the unique culture and heritage	Culture is referenced in the Vision (section 1.5) and it is proposed to add a reference to Caymanian Heritage.	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: "Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic , social and environmental <u>and economic</u> outcomes, while safeguarding <u>Caymanian Heritage, the culture, and the</u> health and general welfare of its people."
	1-128		Infrastructure: define 'modern Cayman society'	The reference to modern society is to ensure that infrastructure continues to support growth while safeguarding health and general welfare.	
FF111	1-129			No Objection	
FF112	1-130		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF113	1-131		Looks lovely. I seem to miss the word "economic growth"which seems to be the backbone of our society. I don't see how that meshes with "environmental benefits".	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF114	1-132		Little Cayman needs to be first since there is no planning document currently and it is at the mercy of all comers with no guidance.	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	1-133		There needs to be no new airport on Little Cayman	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	1-134		development stopped at two stories	Building height restrictions for each zone will be determined within each Area Plan to meet the particular needs of each place.	
	1-135		no new residential developments until the infra structure is complete and 50% of the lots are sold!	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered. A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life	
FF115	1-136		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF116	1-137		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF117	1-138		page 7: 2.2 In my view the cart is before the horse. How are we going to have a development plan if we do not know the number of persons we are developing for? - what is our population capacity? I suggest we development the country with the natural population growth not imported workers	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF118	1-139		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	1-140		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	1-141		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF121	1-142		There was a no truth in your climate resilience objective , unless CUC becomes a solar power station and allows anyone with solar power to tie into the grid.	The Planning Statement supports incorporating risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies. Once such mechanisms and strategies are created and approved by the respective government agency and/or utility provider responsible, they will be factored into the Development Plan process.	
	1-143		And Government needs to make solar more affordable and more easy for everyone to install in their homes.	Section 5.5.12 of the Planning Statement states, "support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources". Once such mechanisms and strategies are approved, they will be factored into the Development Plan process.	
	1-144		The constant spraying especially in LC by the mosquito truck and plane does bode for with your natural environment commitment either.	This is an issue for MRCU and is outside of the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF122	1-145		1.6 housing there are many properties that have fallen into disrepair or damaged by storms- instead of building even more houses, use these instead! There are many properties for sale... so why build even more ?	It is outside the remit of the Planning Statement to restrict private land owners from realizing the developmental potential of their property.	
	1-146		The island has changed so much in the last 11 years- can't see the beach, too much building and high level apartments.	The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.	
	1-147		Too much traffic generated by new developments and less and less land for nature.	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4. This is further support by encouraging mixed use development.	
	1-148		Increased housing is causing more flooding to prevent existing properties as the developers raise the level of the land so it drains onto older properties...	Section 5.5 of the draft Planning Statement supports long-range plans for a holistic stormwater Management Plan and seeks to ensure adequate stormwater infrastructure and design standards.	
	1-149		Infrastructure- why do we need 4 or 6 lane highways when they narrow into one road? This causes speeding and more accidents.	The number of lanes on a highway is outside of the remit of the Planning Statement. However, it aims to support the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability, promoting alternate forms of transportation and on street parking which can inadvertently result in motorists traveling at lower speeds.	
	1-150		Roads are being built with no drainage causing flooding and damage to vehicles.	Road construction is undertaken by the National Roads Authority (NRA) and is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF123	1-151			No Objection	
FF124	1-152		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	1-153		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	1-154			No Objection	
FF127	1-155		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF128	1-156		There should be no height restriction increase beyond the max 10 stories. High rise buildings should have to pay additional fees for upgrades to infrastructure upgrades to roads, waste, and transportation.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning and determine height restrictions for each zone in each Area.	
FF129	1-157		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF130	1-158		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF131	1-159		I agree with all the points besides "economic development". The objectives under this category are conflated. There will be a trade off for enhancing both economy and natural environment. Given the current rates of development is CLEAR, Cayman prioritises the economy to the detriment of the environment. Which is ironic, given without the environment there is no economy. Please see 1. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biad080 2. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26891410 Current example: Continued destruction of the environment in Little Cayman Historical example: Destruction of Grand Cayman' environment	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF132	1-160		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF133	1-161		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF134	1-162		By definition, Strategic Objectives are positive, top-level and defined in general terms. Thus, any objections must make assumptions about implementation which in turn are informed by the objector's context. As a homeowner on Little Cayman, I think it is more useful to prioritize the strategic objectives (and somewhat resent your software making "Yes" automatic, i.e, mandatory.) Natural Environment is the highest priority with the caveat that implementing its definition is done equitably, reasonably, and transparently. Section 1.3.1 states "Ownership of land has always been an important part of the way of life in the Cayman Islands...." There are elderly native-born Caymanians who feel that elements of Department of Environment (DoE) resent that, oppose it and work to undermine it. "They want my land to be theirs." DoE would seem to be the government agency champion (and owner?) of this Strategic Objective. If so, let their work be fair, balanced and transparent.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-163		Climate Resilience would seem to be closely related to Natural Environment and thus also be high priority. However, its "definition" is so vague as to be either meaningless or so open-ended as to be susceptible to abuse. The caveats on Natural Environment might also apply to the Climate Resilience Objective which needs a more clear definition and which might warrant the same "fair, balanced" caveat. Thus, I rate it lowest. Since, e.g., a new generator is not the final long-term power solution, aspects of Infrastructure would be in the middle of our priorities. Housing would actually be low priority for Little Cayman given the self-sufficiency of owners and visitors and the provision of staff housing by most businesses.	The Planning Statement aims to support climate resilience by "incorporating risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies." The basis of this objective is to give the CPA flexibility to integrate technical studies and requisite government policies that are beyond the remit of the Department of Planning to support climate resilience in the development plan and decision making process (e.g. Climate Change Policy, Stormwater & Drainage Plan etc.). Other sections in the draft Planning Statement (i.e. section 5.6(7)) provide further detail and specifics for Resiliency.	
FF135	1-164		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF136	1-165			No Objection	
FF137	1-166		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF138	1-167		Each island has its own individual needs. What is important to Little Cayman does not always apply to the needs of Cayman Brac or Grand Cayman. We need our own Plan.	The Development Plan process facilitates the creation of Area Plans. At that stage of the process, the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an opportunity to detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of their areas.	
FF139	1-168		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF140	1-169		Poor vision for planning , instead of moving the port why don't they just redirect the traffic.	Outside of the remit of the Planning Statement	
FF141	1-170			No Objection	
FF142	1-171		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF143	1-172		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF144	1-173		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF145	1-174		Not as pertains to Grand Cayman. But my interest is Little Cayman which is currently a work in progress.	Comment noted.	
FF146	1-175		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF147	1-176		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF148	1-177		Little Cayman is a pristine Island and it needs its own plan.	The Development Plan process facilitates the creation of Area Plans. At that stage of the process, the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an opportunity to detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of their areas. Little Cayman is no exception in this regard.	
FF149	1-178		The zoning plans by the DCB for Little Cayman is not appropriate for the Island	There is no existing zoning plan for Little Cayman. The Planning Statement is one step in the process of creating an updated Development Plan. In its current dispensation, a plan for all the islands will be included through indicative Area Plans as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement.	
FF150	1-179		A		
FF151	1-180		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF152	1-181			No Objection	
FF153	1-182			No Objection	
FF154	1-183		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF155	1-184		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF156	1-185		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF157	1-186		The objectives on page 6 are sound, but there appears to be no ability to prioritize each objective for each Island. For example Transportation and Infrastructure may be a high priority to Grand Cayman, but Economic Development may be the highest priority for the Brac and Natural Environment and Climate Resilience are key to interests in Little Cayman. For Little Cayman specifically transportation is way down on the list, as there is a need to actually reduce traffic areas to preserve the natural rock iguanas. Housing would also be low on this list as residents are generally expected to be self sufficient and are happy to stay that way. The hotels provide housing for their employees who do not have their own accommodation and this is a stance that should be encouraged and taken further in Grand Cayman. The environment is key to Little Cayman and all residents and visitors alike expect and even demand this, there are very few places left in the world that has the unique qualities of Little Cayman and this should be protected. There appears to be no mechanism included which allows the 3 Islands to adopt a plan appropriate to their unique requirements.	The Development Plan process facilitates the creation of Area Plans. At that stage of the process, the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an opportunity to detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of their areas. Little Cayman is no exception in this regard. It must be noted that the Planning Statement is not intended to be tailored for each island but sets out comprehensive mechanisms/tools that can be utilized.	
FF158	1-187		Consider adding ‘each Island’s’ to the introductory paragraph as follows: “It is intended that the planning strategy for the Islands is flexible enough in concept and implication to accommodate each Island’s individual requirements, special circumstances and changing conditions...”	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4). The current wording is considered suitable.	
	1-188		It is difficult to disagree with the stated objectives as such as they are all admirable and/or practical, but each island should be able to prioritise these objectives in each of their Area Plans in a different order where one objective might conflict with another. This planning document should allow for this.	The Development Plan process facilitates the creation of Area Plans. At that stage of the process, the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an opportunity to detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of their areas. Little Cayman is no exception in this regard. It must be noted that the Planning Statement is not intended to be tailored for each island but sets out comprehensive mechanisms/tools that can be utilized.	
FF159	1-189			No Objection	
FF160	1-190			No Objection	
FF161	1-191		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF162	1-192		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF163	1-193		The stated objectives are unobjectionable; each island should be able to prioritize the objectives according to what best suits them.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-194		For LC clearly the top priority should be the natural environment;	This will be up for consideration and discussion at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan .	
	1-195		golf carts for example should be encouraged.	As stated in the Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement, "transportation - Support greater transportation choices that are sustainable for a growing population while being convenient, reliable, safe and accessible."	
FF164	1-196		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF165	1-197		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF166	1-198			No Objection	
FF167	1-199			No Objection	
FF168	1-200		It assumes that we cannot, don't want to or will not control our population.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF169	1-201			No Objection	
FF170	1-202			No Objection	
FF171	1-203			No Objection	
FF172	1-204			No Objection	
FF173	1-205		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF174	1-206			No Objection	
FF175	1-207		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF176	1-208		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF177	1-209		Economic Development does not need to be part of the strategic objective in regards to planning, it should be protecting our natural resources by planning development so as that the quality of life for Caymanians does not continue to degrade. For too long Planning has made Economic development the priority and we are all witness to The demise of the last decade alone. If Sustainable development is done right, Economic development will be a side effect, it should never be our priority for these islands.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-210		Multinational organizations look for countries with strong infrastructure and competent governments, not a country who can't follow their own laws (i.e. 2024 - 1997 = 27 years...2002, 2007, 2012, 2017, 2022 all overdue and ignored... How can we prioritize developing the economy if organizations think we can't even set a calendar reminder?!)	Previous attempts have been made to update the Development Plan and PlanCayman seeks to divide this into more manageable stages, as outlined in section 1.2/1.3 and figure 1.1 of the draft Planning Statement.	
FF178	1-211		See general feedback and comments (rather than specific objections)	Noted	
FF179	1-212			No Objection	
FF180	1-213		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF181	1-214		Drafting comment: Consider adding 'each Island's' to the introductory paragraph as follows: "It is intended that the planning strategy for the Islands is flexible enough in concept and implication to accommodate each Island's individual requirements, special circumstances and changing conditions..."	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4). The current wording is considered suitable.	
	1-215		Explanation of suggestion/general comment: It is difficult to disagree with the stated objectives as such as they are all admirable and/or practical, but each island should be able to prioritise these objectives in each of their Area Plans in a different order where one objective might conflict with another. For example, if a new hotel site ruins a turtle nesting beach or closes off public open space forever, that is economic development trumping the natural environment. If an airport runway ruins an important bird sanctuary, that is infrastructure trumping the natural environment.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-216		For Little Cayman, the top priority should be the Natural Environment. It is a special place of singular biodiversity which is important internationally, not just nationally, and should be protected as such, much like Ecuador protects the Galapagos as a world heritage site. These planning policies and regulations could, for example, assist in efforts to recognize Little Cayman as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, an effort already initiated by a group on Little Cayman; would support the national and international educational outreach and research of the Central Caribbean Marine Institute (CCMI), which is housed on Little Cayman; and would encourage eco-tourism, the type of tourism that currently overwhelmingly draws divers and other visitors to Little Cayman. Little Cayman is a unique gem which is much loved by many and provides tranquility, rest and relaxation, marine and terrestrial conservation sites, as well as recreation and retirement for its residents and visitors, so the category 'Community facilities' would be considered the second objective on our list. Infrastructure would be in the middle of the list due to the limited nature of the existing infrastructure in Little Cayman. Housing would be last on our list, as (a) local tourism staff housing needs are currently met, traditionally via proactive efforts by local businesses, and (b) those who build or buy in Little are often doing so as a second or retirement home and are expected to be self-sufficient.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-217		For Cayman Brac, Infrastructure is a high priority for those concerned over water shortages, and Economic Development may be the highest priority for those who wish to have opportunities for careers there instead of the 'brain drain' that currently occurs when high schoolers leave for Grand Cayman to seek opportunities for work. By contrast, Housing and Transportation should clearly be the top priorities for Grand Cayman due to the strain of their increased population.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-218		(We suggest that Grand Cayman could also put this into practice and provide that projects over a certain size should also build staff housing.) Similarly, transportation should be discouraged to prevent further decline of the rock iguana population, and instead slower and quieter electric vehicles like golf carts should be encouraged.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-219		Thank you for the opportunity to comment as a homeowner/part-time resident on Little Cayman for over 25 years. A general comment to start on the entire Plan: Little Cayman is unique in that most of the residents and property owners are non Caymanian, of various different sorts of status under Cayman Islands law. The Plan Cayman meeting conducted on Little Cayman talked about all residents having a voice. It must be ensured that the voices heard at such meeting and in submissions such as this are not ignored because in the case of Little Cayman many will not be from Caymanians. Ignoring the majority of voices from the island for that reason would result in a very partial and fragmented view.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands. As stated in Section 1.1 of the Planning Statement, the Development Plan is broken down into sections which will facilitate consultation with the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas.	
	1-220		Section 1 Page 2 Consider adding 'each Island's' to the introductory paragraph as follows: "It is intended that the planning strategy for the Islands is flexible enough in concept and implication to accommodate each Island's individual requirements, special circumstances and changing conditions..." Rationale: The basic structure of the plan, including planning zones, overlay zones and other considerations, provides a basis for a comprehensive plan.	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4). The current wording is considered suitable.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF182	1-221		For Little Cayman, the key section is “Area Plans” (1.4), where for the first time it sets forth that Little Cayman, like other area of the Cayman Islands, should have a plan. What is critical is that the Area Plan for Little Cayman should be developed with input mostly from Little Cayman residents and property owners. Despite its still small size, it should be recognized that Little Cayman now has a large enough population and provides enough economic impact to have an Area Plan developed by those people by and for themselves just as the other areas indicated in Figure 1.2 and consistent with the vision and objectives of sections 1.5 and 1.6.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-222		Little Cayman currently has no plan at all, and development is largely controlled by the Development and Control Board (DCB), which has no Little Cayman representatives and largely represents the development community. This needs to be changed quickly to avoid serious damage, which has been accelerating recently.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands.	
	1-223		This means Little Cayman should be one of the first Area Zones created and legally enacted.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	1-224		In the meantime, and in any subsequent state, Department of Environment objections to plans proposed by the DCB should be observed, with formal legal action necessary for the DCB to bypass DoE objections. To reinforce this rationale: Page 6 in the last paragraph states: Achieving a sustainable economy requires collaboration between the government, businesses, the community and individuals. As such, a secondary objective of the Planning Statement is to provide for and encourage better coordination and co- operation among all interested entities, be they private or public.	Outside of the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	1-225		A development plan for Little Cayman is important in considering the priority of the strategic objectives. I would suggest the priority for Little Cayman, that the top priority should be the Natural Environment. It is a special place of singular biodiversity which is important internationally, not just nationally, and should be protected as such, much like Ecuador protects the Galapagos as a world heritage site. These planning policies and regulations could, for example, assist in efforts to recognize Little Cayman as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, an effort already initiated by a group on Little Cayman; would support the national and international educational outreach and research of the Central Caribbean Marine Institute (CCMI), which is housed on Little Cayman; and would encourage eco-tourism, the type of tourism that currently overwhelmingly draws divers and other visitors to Little Cayman.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-226		Little Cayman is a unique gem which is much loved by many and provides tranquility, rest and relaxation, marine and terrestrial conservation sites, as well as recreation and retirement for its residents and visitors, so the category 'Community facilities' could be considered a higher priority objective. Infrastructure would be in the middle of the list due to the limited nature of the existing infrastructure in Little Cayman. Housing would be last in the priorities, as (a) local tourism staff housing needs are currently met, traditionally via proactive efforts by local businesses, and (b) those who build or buy in Little are often doing so as a second or retirement home and are expected to be self-sufficient. Similarly, transportation should be discouraged to prevent further decline of the rock iguana population.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF183	1-227		Firstly section 21 subsection, one of the development and planning act 2021 revision is not clear enough or sufficient enough in its penalties for developers, who do not comply with the regulations as shown through different developments over time. This has clearly not been enough to deter developers from not complying with the development and planning regulations, it should also be noted that in the interest of time and the future of our community, developers should not have the option to not comply with these regulations.	Outside of the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF184	1-228		Strategic objective priority for Little Cayman should be the protection of the natural environment on land and in the sea.	This will be up for consideration and discussion at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan .	
	1-229		Planning and and development should be undertaken with this at the forefront of consideration.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF185	1-230		Consider adding 'each Island's' to the introductory paragraph as follows: "It is intended that the planning strategy for the Islands is flexible enough in concept and implication to accommodate each Island's individual requirements, special circumstances and changing conditions..."	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4). The current wording is considered suitable.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-231		Explanation of suggestion/general comment: It is difficult to disagree with the stated objectives as such as they are all admirable and/or practical, but each island should be able to prioritise these objectives in each of their Area Plans in a different order where one objective might conflict with another. For example, if a new hotel site ruins a turtle nesting beach or closes off public open space forever, that is economic development trumping the natural environment. If an airport runway ruins an important bird sanctuary, that is infrastructure trumping the natural environment.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-232		For Cayman Brac, Infrastructure is a high priority for those concerned over water shortages, and Economic Development may be the highest priority for those who wish to have opportunities for careers there instead of the 'brain drain' that currently occurs when high schoolers leave for Grand Cayman to seek opportunities for work. By contrast, Housing and Transportation should clearly be the top priorities for Grand Cayman due to the strain of their increased population.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-233		For Little Cayman, the top priority should be the Natural Environment. It is a special place of singular biodiversity which is important internationally, not just nationally, and should be protected as such, much like Ecuador protects the Galapagos as a world heritage site. These planning policies and regulations could, for example, assist in efforts to recognize Little Cayman as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, an effort already initiated by a group on Little Cayman; would support the national and international educational outreach and research of the Central Caribbean Marine Institute (CCMI), which is housed on Little Cayman; and would encourage eco-tourism, the type of tourism that currently overwhelmingly draws divers and other visitors to Little Cayman.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-234		Little Cayman is a unique gem which is much loved by many and provides tranquility, rest and relaxation, marine and terrestrial conservation sites, as well as recreation and retirement for its residents and visitors, so the category 'Community facilities' would be considered the second objective on our list. Infrastructure would be in the middle of the list due to the limited nature of the existing infrastructure in Little Cayman. Housing would be last on our list, as (a) local tourism staff housing needs are currently met, traditionally via proactive efforts by local businesses, and (b) those who build or buy in Little are often doing so as a second or retirement home and are expected to be self-sufficient.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-235		(We suggest that Grand Cayman could also put this into practice and provide that projects over a certain size should also build staff housing.)	Noted and thank you for the suggestion. This can be considered as part of the Government's response to Affordable Housing issues, led by Ministry of PAHITD.	
	1-236		Similarly, transportation should be discouraged to prevent further decline of the rock iguana population, and instead slower and quieter electric vehicles like golf carts should be encouraged.	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4.	
FF186	1-237		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF187	1-238		I have no objections, per se, to the 7 Strategic Objectives. I was happy to read that the objective will be considered "flexible enough in concept and implication to accomodate individual requirements". Grand Cayman's objectives and goals will be different from Cayman Brac's, and these two will be markedly different from the island of my greatest concern - Little Cayman. Little Cayman's culture and natural capital needs to be protected and preserved. This might include limits of house design, transportation (EV only), the number of tourists allowed per year, better and stricter infrastructure rules and requirements etc. The Development Plan needs to protect the natural environment and focus the strategic economic development in a way that gives Little Cayman the chance to be recognised as a UNESCO World Heritage site. So Little Cayman's Strategic Objectives will likely be different from the other Cayman Area Plans.	Each indicative area as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an Area Plan which will be unique, outlining character through zoning in collaboration with the people.	
FF188	1-239			No Objection	
FF189	1-240		No objection, in principle, but would like the Objectives to be fine-tuned in the case of Little Cayman. Such as, housing would naturally be kept to a minimum as not a large intake of workers on the island. Private homes and tourist accomodation, not to be built with more than two floors of living space. Transportation would not require bus service, as the island's transportation needs are low. As previously mentioned under Housing, Infrastructure should be kept in harmony with the island, and constrction no more than two floors of living space.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF190	1-241		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF191	1-242		Not an objection, per se, but more a comment that the Sister Islands each deserve their own considerations. So, for example, while the strategic objections are well thought, development on Little Cayman would, I hope, be treated and considered in a much different light than on Grand Cayman.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF192	1-243			No Objection	
FF193	1-244			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF194	1-245		I think that Little Cayman needs to have its own specific planning objectives separated out from Grand and Brac. Our natural environment is the most important and needs to be protected. Little Caymans opportunity to be a UNESCO world Heritage Site should be documented in the strategic plan. little Cayman is home to the Central Caribbean Marine Institute, an organization dedicated to research and education. Their work is becoming increasingly important with the current climate changes occurring in the Caymans.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	1-246		Additionally in response to infrastructure, Little Cayman is a special place that cannot support development without serious consideration of our limited infrastructure related to septic and trash disposal, and limited water resources.	Infrastructure will form part of the considerations for each Area Plan. The broad policies are set out in section 5.5	
FF195	1-247		1.Housing 2.Transportation 3.Climate Resilience 4.Natural Environment 5.Economic Development 6.Infrastructure 7.Community Facilities It needs to be realized each of the 3 islands are different and special places. All of the above strategic objectives need to be designed with the unique character of each of the 3 islands. It needs to have local inout and decision making by island. They are gems, but soon each will feel like ever other place in the world and lose their benefits that make them what they are.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	1-248		Little Cayman is really the only place left like it and as it gets developed, it will lose its' appeal and tremendous economic benefit it can have in the long run. People choose to live on the island they are on for the most part. If they change or others not on that particular island make decisions for the other islands, it defeats the special appeal of each island and will only alienate the residents. On Little Cayman, development decisions need to consider preserving all the unique natural features that are almost gone from anywhere else in the Caribbean. Short term monetary gain will have very long term and large economic losses that can never be gained back.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF196	1-249		Suggest a different order of priority for Little Cayman with Natural Environment as too priority.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF197	1-250		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF198	1-251		Housing (page 8): There is an inappropriate mix of housing and rental properties available currently in the Cayman Islands, I object the sentiment of having a "mix of housing options". I would like to see the strategic objectives serving lower-income communities and advocating for affordable housing for the next generation. A "mix" of housing does not address the statistics or provide evidence for different percentages of housing that will be planned. With the increase in population, there should be a cross-examination of the estimated income bracket the new populous will be in as well as an examination of the current demographics wanting to own or rent. Questions that have been asked during public consultations remain unanswered as to what type of 'holistic' mix of housing this would entail and the strategic objectives should reflect concrete understanding of what types of housing are required to meet the demand of our growing population.	The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions within communities along with mixed used developments and vibrant centres (work spaces). Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas. The Planning Statement, the DoP, CPA and DCB are not responsible for conducting affordable housing needs studies but to create a Development Plan that will support these polices when they are brought forward. Kindly note, The Ministry of Planning, Agriculture, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport and Development (PAHITD) launched a comprehensive survey aimed at gathering valuable insights to inform the development of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan.	
	1-252		Transportation (page 24): I reject the northern development of the EWA road extension and accept the southern B2 alternative route, given its southern location will be less damaging to the Central Mangrove Wetlands, and minimize any further development into the Central Mangrove Wetlands due to its important and central services for creating weather patterns and protecting Grand Cayman from storm surges. I object to additional corridors and roads being added until current roads are built with public transportation lanes.	The alignment of the East-west Arterial corridor is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. Section 5.4(5) supports existing future public transport operations.	
	1-253		Public transportation must be integrated into the Plan Cayman Development Plan, not "encouraged". It is absolutely essential to increase and improve public transportation networks and vehicles in the Cayman Islands if the population increase is to be encouraged and planned for.	The Planning Statement can only support "existing and future public transport operations" as it is not within the remit of the CPA, DCB and DoP to create public transportation polices. The Development Plan will support approved policies put forward by the Public Transport Unit / Ministry PAHITD.	
FF199	1-254		No Objection		
FF200	1-255		No Objection		
FF201	1-256		Page # 6 - 1.5 Vision (Natural Environment) I think it is admirable what has been done to protect the blue iguanas from extinction – all because their natural habitats elsewhere were destroyed by developers – not by the landowners in East End! Because of their success, the powers that be have now gone overboard. In about 2005, they purchased land to replace the natural habitat that the iguanas lost. Unfortunately, they chose an area that iguanas cannot thrive in. To make matters worse, they now want to tell surrounding landowners what they can and cannot do with their property! I would like to know what happens if an iguana strays to an adjoining property because it is cultivated and therefore more appealing to iguanas. Can they lay claim to that property by saying it is a natural habitat for iguanas – or prevent development at a future date because an iguana was spotted on the property? They don't have to hold the title to a property. All they need to do is put enough restrictions on it to render it useless to the owner.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF202	1-257		I don't agree with the Plan set for Little Cayman. Little Cayman is a peistine jewl of the Cayman Islands and because of what it represents it attracts the right type of tourism. Over all, the design in the plan will be the end of Little Cayman as we know it, and though, the island do need some improvements in infrastructure and housing the idea of it becoming even close to what Grand Cayman is will destroy that has been all this time the main attraction. Iguanas roam free, Trutle nest everyway, wisteling ducks are a common sight... I don't see how The Government Plan can be sustainable. If anything, Little Cayman needs help promoting the island as it is and that, alone, will be developing the island in an eco-friendly way. Mass Tourism is not the right tourism, it's a destoeoyer of the natural resources of any country.	The Planning Statement does not set out a Plan for any of the 3 islands. It defines the Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations that will applied within each of the Area Plans as set out in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement. Also note, the Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF203	1-258			No Objection	
FF204	1-259		I think it is imperative that each island should have say in what impacts them. What works for Grand doesn't necessarily work for Little or Brac. As a property owner on Little, I'm most concerned with environmental impact of overdevelopment.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF205	1-260		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF206	1-261		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF207	1-262		A page of well-meaning but ultimately imprecise goals. As an example of the plan using many words to essentially say nothing, who decides what the "most desirable balance" is? Most desirable for whom?	The Development Plan is being created via consultation with the people of the Cayman Islands who at the Area Plan phase of the process will assist in determining the character of their indicative areas through zoning and policy advice.	
	1-263		Why is the plan "flexible and intend to accommodate individual requirements"?	As stated in Section 1.6, the plan has to be flexible to support Cayman's established role as a place that can grow in response to global economies, whilst also supporting high quality of life standards.	
	1-264		DO you have the luxury of being flexible given the overcrowding and the high cost of living for Caymanians?	As stated in Section 1.6, the plan has to be flexible to support Cayman's established role as a place that can grow in response to global economies, whilst also supporting high quality of life standards.	
	1-265		Clearly the "plan" so far has been "MONEY RULES" where those with vast financial resources get whatever they want. This initial page should clearly state that the future of the Cayman Islands cannot be based on greed nor desire constant growth given the limited livable space of this island nation.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-266		The plan should state as a goal to build a working economy without constant new development of land, without additional population growth (and even ways to reduce population through guest worker visa reductions), and rather focus on how the country can succeed while maintaining steady or lower population numbers and no new land developments, which are realities that the nation will hit sooner or later due to being surrounded by water.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF208	1-267		I support the objectives, but am very concerned that with the current trajectory for growth, it will be impossible to achieve these. The missing objective to achieve sustainable development is growth management, but the entire document is silent on this.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF209	1-268			No Objection	
FF210	1-269		1) Section 1.6 Strategic Objectives (p.6): There is a lack of Caymanian identity in the context of what the Draft National Development Plan proposes. Primarily, what is stated in 'Section 1.6 Strategic Objectives' (p.6) is too broad and in context leaves room for foreign influences from both local and foreign developers to direct how the Cayman Islands develops in the present and for the future. Such influences that have proven to have a lack of respect for the traditions and values of (generational) Caymanians. Developers who in which have an advantage over those from the lower and middle classes to generate wealth, profit and ultimately financial security.	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate. The Area Plan approach provides a mechanism for the community within in each area to have greater input into the Plan Review process.	
	1-270		The primary objective of the plan should be to maintain and enhance the society and not just the 'enhance the economy...' of the Cayman Islands, which is stated first in this section.	Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement states, " The primary objective of the Plan is to maintain and enhance the economy, society and the environment". The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-271		To be more specific, a Caymanian society that has not only evolved and developed, but is reflective of Caymanian traditions, beliefs and values.	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-272		The maintenance and enhancement of our Caymanian society can be achieved through the means of sustainable development that protects and where necessary, solely preserves the natural environment for the benefit of all Caymanians and residents who value the traditional Cayman Islands.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-273		This is with saying that the growth of the economy has been prioritised over the wellbeing of the Caymanian people who in the present are facing repercussions and many challenges from the lack of a National Development Plan (i.e.: the outdated and poorly managed 1997 Development Plan) that sufficiently guided the country - residents, public and private sectors - into developing the country with an infrastructure that is efficient, sufficient and beneficial to the wellbeing of the Caymanian people.	Section 2 of the Planning Statement acknowledges the challenges faced in the Cayman Islands and highlights the need for an updated Development Plan.	
FF211	1-274			No Objection	
FF212	1-275		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	1-276			No Objection	
FF214	1-277			No Objection	
FF215	1-278		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	1-279		All very vague, not very detailed or share any metrics of success if and when plans are put in place.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES GOALS Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section
FF217	1-280		For natural environment, there should be an addition of the conservation of migratory pathways, corridors and key stopover sites, needed for them access a place for breeding, foraging and refuge/roosting. If you consider some of the crab species on the island, some which locals use a food source, this fishery can only be sustained if crabs are given access to the sea for breeding. We should consider sustainable preservation of migratory routes, via greenspaces and/or corridors, that give them safe passage to the sea.	Section 4.2 of the draft Planning Statement seeks to preserve and protect key habitats through the identification of Natural Resource Preservation Overlays.	
	1-281		For infrastructure, addition of "...maintaining accessibility to a safe environment..." After injuring my foot I discovered much of Cayman's infrastructure does not allow safe access to many buildings. If you are bound to a wheel chair, have visual impairments or require a service dog it is near impossible to navigate or gain access to places of worship, buildings, services (even government services), greenspaces, beaches, coastlines, etc. There is barely a continual safe walking paths or areas that connect on an even path for a wheelchair to role, in fact it is difficult for those with 2 working legs, if you need to depend on a wheelchair, crutches, need a Guide Dog or someone to help you, you will sooner be hit by a car. Accessibility and connectivity are attributes that need to be considered for sustainable plan.	Noted. Section 5.6(5) indicates that building design should meet a minimum level of compliance with various local Building Codes in respect of human safety and accessibility.	
	1-282		For transportation, here we need safe accessible connectivity through out the island that encourages health habits and lifestyles, giving access to greenspaces and the sea.	The Planning Statement and the subsequent Development Plan supports transportation and connectivity. The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4.	
FF218	1-283			No Objection	
	1-284		Sustainable development is the most important aspect of what is needed in a new plan. A vague graphic with a few points copied from the internet does not even come close to satisfy the requirements needed here. You have literally copied the mandate of the NCC from their website and yet have shown zero regard for any of these principals.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	1-285		The 1997 Plan does not restrict any form of SD principals but DoP have rarely if ever been proactive in employing any of them.	The draft Planning Statement seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations. The proposed Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations support this.	
	1-286		This section should go beyond the basic needs of society to include the actual SD principals the new plan should/would/could employ including coastal setbacks, proper rainwater management (because deep wells don't work), vegetation buffers and wildlife corridors, minimum requirements for greenspaces and national parks, and the myriad of other SD practices being employed in island nations like ours AND it should clearly state that the legislative framework to support these practices will also be included in the new plan including support for the establishment of protected areas and critical habitats by the NCC to protect, promote and preserve Cayman's native species/wildlife.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to define each of the Zones, Overlay and broad Policy Considerations. Subsequent stages - Area Plans - provide an opportunity to set more specific requirements and restrictions depending on the needs, constraints and opportunities of an Area.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF219	1-287		Further to this, there needs to be an entire section on the impacts of climate change and exactly what mitigation measures make the most sense for our islands. We have MSCR and a team of climate scientists at DoE and my understanding is there was no consultation with them on these matters.	Section 2.7 of the draft Planning Statement outlines the impacts that Climate Change will have on the Islands. Some additions and amendments are proposed to this section. In terms of mitigation measures, the draft Planning Statement outlines numerous resiliency measures and greater detail is anticipated in each Area Plan to reflect the climate change impacts anticipated in those places. MSCR is a part of the project team for the Planning Statement and will be engaged on an ongoing basis as the Plan Review progresses.	Amend s.2.7, as follows: "A number of significant <i>changes in</i> climate <i>change-impacts</i> are affecting the Cayman Islands, including changes in storms, cyclones, winds, waves and storm surges; changes in ocean circulation; <i>changes in rainfall patterns and changes-in</i> freshwater input; ocean acidification; changes in salinity; <i>accelerated</i> sea-level rise; increasing air and sea temperature <i>s</i> (including humidity); <i>increasing-coastal-erosion</i> ; and decreasing dissolved oxygen of seawater. <i>These create a host of impacts, including but not limited to heatwaves, droughts and floods; increased coastal erosion; reduced agricultural productivity; and increased diseases which jeopardise lives, livelihoods and property.</i> These impacts and the resulting risks to the Cayman Islands economy, society, biodiversity and habitats are detailed in the Cayman Islands Climate Change Risk Assessment which is updated every five years. "
	1-288		How on Earth can you even proceed with even the framework of a Development Plan without having clear guidelines on real life SD practices and how they will work to protect our people in the future from the impacts of climate change? Beyond negligent.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to define each of the Zones, Overlay and broad Policy Considerations. Subsequent stages - Area Plans - provide an opportunity to set more specific requirements and restrictions depending on the needs, constraints and opportunities of an Area.	
FF220	1-289			No Objection	
FF221	1-290		First objective is similar to the defined Vision presented in the Section 1.5. An objective should be quantifiable/measurable - how maintaining and enhancing the economy, society and environment will be measured? What are the steps taken to evaluate the benefits brought in by this endeavor?	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES GOALS
	1-291		The second strategic is generic and does not state how the communication will be improved and what are the methods to achieve these objectives. There are too many strategic objectives which are assigned in isolation to each domain, without acknowledging the interdependencies between them. Overall, the strategic objectives are not showing a holistic approach which for the Cayman Islands should be essential. In addition, these strategic objectives are not well defined in relation to the differentiation that has been defined in section 1.4 referring to Area Plans. How transportation infrastructure choices can be made available without a unitary vision for each island.	The Planning Statement is the Mission statement for PlanCayman. The policies contained within, will be implemented through individual area plans and through collaboration with relevant agencies. The process allows for continuous review and engagement and public / stakeholder involvement on a more regular basis. The Plan will be monitored, reviewed and updated every 5 years. Each Area Plan will be prepared in full consultation with infrastructure providers, allowing for consideration of how each Area Plan fits within wider strategic infrastructure plans.	
FF222	1-292			No Objection	
FF223	1-293			No Objection	
FF224	1-294		I have no objections to the Strategic Objectives of page 6, but, Housing: an appropriate mix of housing for the community will require a mix of varied lot sizes in subdivision projects,	Noted. Section 5.3(2) seeks to make efficient use of land within subdivisions. Subdivisions can incorporate varied lot sizes and appropriate locations for this can be considered within each Area Plan.	
	1-295		Transportation: greater transportation choices require wider road corridors,	Noted. Planning Statement supports existing and future public transportation modes. The highway design required to facilitate this is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	1-296		Infrastructure: the population is growing faster than we can formulate infrastructure policy, not to mention construct and development.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
WR1-A	1-297			No Objection	
WR1-B	1-298		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR2	1-299		In general, the framework of the Planning Statement appears to be a sensible way forward. There are some errors which need to be corrected (such as the bullets in section 1.3.3 not corresponding to the sections in section 5 so suggest section 1.3.3 be amended).	Noted. Section 1.3.3 recommended to be amended	Section 1.3.3 - Delete ' Community Facilities -' from bullet-point list
	1-300		Section 1, Background. The basic structure of the plan, including planning zones, overlay zones and other considerations, provides a basis for a comprehensive plan. For Little Cayman, the key section is "Area Plans" (1.4), where for the first time it sets forth that Little Cayman, like other area of the Cayman Islands, should have a plan. What is critical is that the Area Plan for Little Cayman should be developed with input mostly from Little Cayman residents and property owners.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands. As stated in Section 1.1 of the Planning Statement, the Development Plan is broken down into sections which will facilitate consultation with the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR3	1-301		Despite its still small size, it should be recognized that Little Cayman now has a large enough population and provides enough economic impact to have an Area Plan developed by those people by and for themselves just as the other areas indicated in Figure 1.2 and consistent with the vision and objectives of sections 1.5 and 1.6. Little Cayman currently has no plan at all, and development is largely controlled by the Development and Control Board (DCB), which has no Little Cayman representatives and largely represents the development community. This needs to be changed quickly to avoid serious damage, which has been accelerating recently.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	1-302		This means Little Cayman should be one of the first Area Zones created and legally enacted.	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	1-303		In the meantime, and in any subsequent state, Department of Environment objections to plans proposed by the DCB should be observed, with formal legal action necessary for the DCB to bypass DoE objections.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
WR4	1-304		I agree with the use of areas and zones for planning purposes. Little Cayman and Cayman Brac should each have their own zones and plans and not be considered as one entity.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands. As stated in Section 1.1 of the Planning Statement, the Development Plan is broken down into sections which will facilitate consultation with the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	1-305		LC should also have its own legislative member and not a shared member with CB.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	1-306		Presently, LC has no zones and no development plan. Development is primarily regulated by the Development Control Board, which has several developers and no representatives from LC. This is not acceptable. Therefore, the first order of business for the Planning Committee is to fast-track plans for Little Cayman and Cayman Brac so they will not experience massive, unwanted development in the next 5 years. Please take care of the sister islands first, as they have no protection in the form of a plan and are at the whim of the DCB, which has not been kind to the islands.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands. As stated in Section 1.1 of the Planning Statement, the Development Plan is broken down into sections which will facilitate consultation with the people of the Cayman Islands within the indicative areas. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	1-307		The primary objective for Little Cayman should be maintenance of the unique natural environment, wildlife, peace and quiet. These are the reasons why tourists come here and spend their money here. They dive, swim, snorkel, watch birds, reptiles and sea turtle nests, hike, bike, kayak, fish, examine native plants, and take photographs. These tourists are not particularly interested in merchandise or nighttime entertainment. It is also why people who live on GC like to weekend and vacation on LC and spend their money here.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
WR5	1-308			No Objection	
WR6	1-309			No Objection	
WR7	1-310			No Objection	
WR8	1-311			No Objection	
WR9	1-312			No Objection	
WR10	1-313			No Objection	
WR11	1-314			No Objection	
WR12	1-315			No Objection	
WR13	1-316			No Objection	
	1-317		Consider adding ‘each Island’s’ to the introductory paragraph as follows: “It is intended that the planning strategy for the Islands is flexible enough in concept and implication to accommodate each Island’s individual requirements, special circumstances and changing conditions...” It is difficult to disagree with the stated objectives as such as they are all admirable and/or practical, but each island should be able to prioritise these objectives in each of their Area Plans in a different order where one objective might conflict with another. For example, if a new hotel site ruins a turtle nesting beach or closes off public open space forever, that is economic development trumping the natural environment. If an airport runway ruins an important bird sanctuary, that is infrastructure trumping the natural environment.	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4). The current wording is considered suitable.	
	1-318				

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR14	1-319		For Cayman Brac, Infrastructure is a high priority for those concerned over water shortages, and Economic Development may be the highest priority for those who wish to have opportunities for careers there instead of the 'brain drain' that currently occurs when high schoolers leave for Grand Cayman to seek opportunities for work. By contrast, Housing and Transportation should clearly be the top priorities for Grand Cayman due to the strain of their increased population.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	1-320		For Little Cayman, the top priority should be the Natural Environment. It is a special place of singular biodiversity which is important internationally, not just nationally, and should be protected as such, much like Ecuador protects the Galapagos as a world heritage site. These planning policies and regulations could, for example, assist in efforts to recognize Little Cayman as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, an effort already initiated by a group on Little Cayman; would support the national and international educational outreach and research of the Central Caribbean Marine Institute (CCMI), which is housed on Little Cayman; and would encourage eco-tourism, the type of tourism that currently overwhelmingly draws divers and other visitors to Little Cayman. Little Cayman is a unique gem which is much loved by many and provides tranquility, rest and relaxation, marine and terrestrial conservation sites, as well as recreation and retirement for its residents and visitors, so the category 'Community facilities' would be considered the second objective on our list. Infrastructure would be in the middle of the list due to the limited nature of the existing infrastructure in Little Cayman. Housing would be last on our list, as (a) local tourism staff housing needs are currently met, traditionally via proactive efforts by local businesses, and (b) those who build or buy in Little are often doing so as a second or retirement home and are expected to be self-sufficient. (We suggest that Grand Cayman could also put this into practice and provide that projects over a certain size should also build staff housing.) Similarly, transportation should be discouraged to prevent further decline of the rock iguana population, and instead slower and quieter electric vehicles like golf carts should be encouraged.	Noted and thank you for the comments and suggestions. The Area Plan approach will enable many of these issues to be considered and incorporated where possible.	
WR15	1-321		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR16	1-322		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR17	1-323		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR18	1-324		I asked the panel whether the Natural Resource Overlay Zone was in fact going to stop all further development on land which is home to endangered, threatened and endemic wildlife and their habitats. And I was told, by the head and deputy head of the CPA, that No, this would not be happening. They said Caymanians who owned land were entitled to develop it and would continue to be able to develop in very sensitive areas which fell inside the NROZ, perhaps with some (unspecified) restrictions. They said there needed to be a balance between land owners' rights and environmental conservation. So I see the plan not working right here. Allowing further development in highly sensitive and pristine areas – which is what the CPA is intending to do, they said – is not in keeping with the DP's stated environmental conservation objectives (as quoted above). If the DP is truly aiming to "secure" important ecological areas, then those areas need to be named and specified, and all development inside those areas be forbidden/disallowed under the plan. That way, the plan will meet its stated environmental objectives.	The CPA, DCB & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. These overlays aim to enforce sustainable development in areas (privately owned parcels) with underlying developable zoning. This will facilitate greater environmental protection measures when developing within said areas. The nature of the resource / habitat / ecosystem will determine the additional considerations and/or mitigation measures within each NRP Overlay.	
WR19	1-325		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR20	1-326		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	1-327		Over the last 48 years, I sat in I don't know how many of these meeting and we've talked about, I guess, basically what this is about, and it seems that whatever the community has come up with and it's gone in, wherever it goes, it's been forgotten after it was submitted.	As part of the consultation process for PlanCayman all submitted representations are recorded and uploaded to the PlanCayman website with responses	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-328	1.1 Introduction	Tell every one of your politicians what you want to see for your Cayman. Guess what guys, many of us here tonight, I look around the room, many of you here are much older than me but there's three younger ones in here and I'm sure that they want a better Cayman for themselves and for their children. I know I certainly want it for my children and my grandchildren. So, you know what, the only how it can be better is if we take it upon ourselves to make it better for them; and we're not going to be dictated to no longer by no one sitting on their lotters drawing up plans, try to push it down our throats in three months and expect for us to accept it. That's unacceptable. This must be a longer process and if it takes us going to the Parliament, writing a petition, whatever it is it needs to be done for us to get the best outcome from this process. Kenneth, I heard you six weeks ago when you offered on OC Show too, when you called in and I should do what you're doing here tonight. I also heard you last week and again today and I thank you and the other who have taken the initiative to do what you guys are doing. I think that's very admirable, and it shows your love for your district and the Cayman Islands. One other thing, the road from East West must go to East End. Stop fooling, making them talk about EIAs, what we are going to give, 100 feet of mangrove straight up there? No, no put the road in, forget the EIA, that needs to go to East End, otherwise, our infrastructure and our agriculture will never develop. That's my opinion.	Noted. The East West Arterial is subject to an EIA process and is outside the scope of the Planning Statement consultation	
	1-329		This is where the District Councils would come in handy, and it is not a reality although it is embedded in the new Constitution.	Noted. As demonstrated during the Planning Statement consultation, some communities are forming groups to help coordinate comments, which may assist during Area Plan preparation.	
	1-330		Advised that CPA is not going to extend time as they claim it could be subject to Tribunal Appeal.	At its meeting of 14 August 2024 (CPA/21/24; item 3.1) the Authority was advised that representation was received from the West Bay Feedback Committee requesting the public consultation period be extended until September 30, 2024. The Authority considered the request and determined it could not be granted as to do so would be contrary to the provisions of Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision).	
	1-331		Rearrange the Review sequence and start with Area Plans and Zoning.	The PlanCayman process has been established to ensure that broad national goals are identified first, prior to being implemented on an Area-by-Area basis, in a way that is appropriate to that area. The Planning Statement defines the various Zones and Overlays, which will be applied within each Area Plan.	
	1-332		Will proposed amendments be vetted by Legal prior to being submitted to Parliament?	Amendments to Regulations will be prepared by Legal	
	1-333		Is the CPA and Government bound by The National Planning Framework and Planning Statement or are they just wishes?	The National Planning Framework (NPF) remains a broad policy document which forms the overarching basis for more specific components of the plan. It is a not a document that the CPA can base decisions upon. The Planning Statement however, when passed in Parliament, would become legislation.	
	1-334		They are not going to extend time because Christine Maltman was very specific that they are following the guidelines of the Law or whatever it is, because of the fact of once the period of public engagement closes, then you enter this Tribunal Phase. If they extend or change or do anything then they could be subject to Tribunal Appeal, if they don't follow it by the book. I think that is an excuse myself but what about the postponements, like North Side was supposed to be the 4th July? I bet you they will say the live broadcast will be enough.	At its meeting of 14 August 2024 (CPA/21/24; item 3.1) the Authority was advised that representation was received from the West Bay Feedback Committee requesting the public consultation period be extended until September 30, 2024. The Authority considered the request and determined it could not be granted as to do so would be contrary to the provisions of Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision). All consultation events that were postponed due to Hurricane Beryl were rescheduled and advertised accordingly.	
	1-335	1.3.1 Planning Zones	"Orderly development and a flexible approach to land zoning" are incompatible. It must be one or the other.	Planning zones can provide certain flexibility as is appropriate for a given location and zoning category. This can still be under broader zoning requirements that enable orderly development	
	1-336		The proposed "flexible approach" to land zoning should not be adopted as the word "flexible" indicates that a certain zone can be changed at any time. That seems counter-productive to the concept of zoning in the first place. This option should be discarded.	Flexibility does not permit changing of zones (that is a process called 'Rezone' which is an amendment to the Development Plan). Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	
	1-337		Definition of Orderly and Flexible required. It could have wide ranging impacts if not narrowed down.	The Planning Statement is intended to define the Zones that will have different requirements in different areas. Area Plans will provide further information / evidence / detail within each zoning category.	
	1-338		Are they trying to make zoning stricter?	The requirements for each zone will be determined on an Area by Area basis to best serve the needs of those places	
	1-339		Should the process have started with Area Plans first and then the zoning?	The Planning Statement defines the various Zones and Overlays. These will be applied to different locations during the Area Plan process	
	1-340		Concern about the amount of development because by the time we get this done there won't be much left to plan. Area Plans should be done first – lock it in and then figure this out.	The Planning Statement introduces the concept of Area Plans and would establish this in legislation, to enable the process to continue and for Area Plan preparation to commence	
	1-341		Putting first things first – the Population. The Table of Contents – Do not see anything about Population. Reference Dr. Pedley's Report on Population. Need info on Population Projection then put people and activities in these plans.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	1-342		Concentrate on where zoning will start. Think plan to start at George Town. They are not dealing with everything one time – too much. Agree some areas need to be dealt with separately.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	1-343		Dart proposed converting Launching Ramp into Community Open Space for Yacht Club residents, not Public Open Space for the public.	Individual applications and projects are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	
	1-344		Many small pieces of land within sub-divisions that do not serve any purpose. Could Govt allow them to purchase it back and Govt purchase a bigger parcel of land for public purposes?	LPP lands are privately owned. It is acknowledged that LPPs should be better utilised, and this is contained in sections 3.8 and 5.9 of the Planning Statement	
	1-345		Baseline data – what measures of effectiveness do we have for this Plan?	The Planning Statement is just one part of the overall Development Plan. Each Area Plan will include baseline data and key performance indicators	
	1-346		Caymanians not mentioned. Whose Culture? Ours or whose?	The NPF and Planning Statement have been prepared with reference to the National Culture Heritage Policy and Strategic Plan. The plan represents the needs of the whole community.	
	1-347	1.3.3	NATURAL RESOURCES - Reference shall be made to coastal setbacks with regard to their importance as erosion mitigator tools.	Section 5.7(7) states 'Apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations'	
	1-348		Community Facilities – We recommend that it be changed to Community Zones as the CPA / DCB has authority to provide for zones but not facilities.	Noted. Recognise that CPA does not have authority to provide facilities themselves, however as with all infrastructure, the Authority creates the zoning framework to allow for certain uses, facilities etc. Section 3.6 concerns Community Zones. The reference should be removed from the bullet point list in section 1.3.3 as this is not included in the 'Other Policy Considerations' section.	Section 1.3.3 - Delete ' Community Facilities ' from bullet-point list
	1-349		Economy - is not mentioned in Schedule II of The Development and Planning Act 2021, as a matter that can be included in Development plans. If it is legal to do so and it is included it shall be subject to the caveat that it is to the “benefit of Caymanians”.	Section 5.10 sets out high-level considerations for supporting Commercial, Tourism and Industrial activities. S.9(1) of the Development and Planning Act states that a Development Plan may “allocate areas of land for use for agricultural, residential, industrial or other purposes of any use or class specified in the plan.”	
	1-350	1.4	We support the inclusion of Area Plans	Noted	
	1-351		I would probably prefer a uniformity not more flexibility, but for the zoning to be applied across the island so that everybody knows where they stand rather than you know, with the DBC decides one thing and then Grand Cayman comes out with something else for formatting area plans through the islands.	Noted. The Zones and Overlays defined in the Planning Statement are the full set, no additional zones or overlays will be introduced until the Planning Statement is reviewed. The Area Plan process allows these Zones and Overlays to be applied in a way that is appropriate for each area (so detailed requirements will vary between Areas). This is intended to avoid some of the issues that arise under the currently zoning approach where certain zone requirements are not appropriate in some locations.	
	1-352	1.5	We object to the Vision because Quality of Life (QoL) indicators are not defined. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether we have maintained or enhanced it. How is “the most desirable balance” defined? A national set of SMART QoL indicators are required prior to the Plan being progressed.	Noted. It is recommended to amend the 'Strategic Objectives' to 'Goals' since indicators have not been included. However, each Area Plan will include an implementation schedule and Key Performance Indicators to monitor its effectiveness.	
	1-353		Heritage to be included along with Culture	Agreed, heritage can be added to the Vision	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: “Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic , social and environmental and economic outcomes, while safeguarding Caymanian Heritage , the culture, and the health and general welfare of its people.”
	1-354	1.6	We OBJECT to the wording and suggest the following: • The objectives shall be SMART so that we, Caymanians, can determine if the objectives were achieved and hold our leaders accountable as to why the objectives were/were not achieved.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identifies progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-355		“Improve the physical, social, environmental (and economic) environments for Caymanians.”	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate	
	1-356		Delete section stating that the Planning Strategy is flexible enough ... to accommodate individual requirements (see 1.3.1 above).	As stated in Section 1.6, the plan has to be flexible to support Cayman's established role as a place that can grow in response to global economies, whilst also supporting high quality of life standards. It is recognised that individual requirements can vary based on a range of facts (such as site conditions, market forces etc) and so the wording in the draft Planning Statement is considered to be suitable.	
	1-357		Amend “that all development seeks to balance and integrate physical, social, environmental (and economic considerations) ... benefits Caymanians.	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate	
	1-358		Economic considerations shall be defined.	The Objective / Goal below provides further explanation about Economic Development, and additional policies are contained in section 5.10.	
	1-359		Definition required for “Achieving a sustainable economy”.	This is a defined below under 'Economic Development' - "Support a thriving and diverse economy that promotes wider economic and environmental benefits"	
	1-360		The objective is not SMART. It must be.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-361		Change to “provide zone(s) for an appropriate mix of housing for the whole community”.	This objective / goal may be achieved in more ways than just providing appropriate zones. Certain decisions or regulation amendments may be necessary at some stage to help to achieve this, and so the current wording is considered appropriate.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-362	1.6 - HOUSING	I have a concern and I don't know if this is the correct place to raise it but talking about the land situation is that our young people, we don't have land in West Bay, but we have our children etcetera here. There is a situation now where our West Bay people are having to go to Bodden Town and other places to purchase land and to live there away from their family because they there's they can't afford land here; it's too expensive. We have another situation with our youth coming out of school they cannot afford to pay the rent, they cannot afford to buy land, they can't build a home and, so many of them now end up in a homeless situation. I have taken one before for a short/temporary and I have another one in my house right now. Young people coming out of School, holding two jobs but still can't pay their rent. I have a big concern with land and also someone mentioned about the planning fees, even as just a general middle-class Caymanian, or whatever, paying the planning fees are a lot. You got the architecture fees they have gone out of the roof now; I mean, I don't see how Caymanians can survive any longer in this environment; especially the younger Caymanians that presently don't have anything.	Noted. The supply and cost of housing is recognised in section 2.5 of the draft Planning Statement document. Section 3.3 seeks to provide safe and comfortable housing options for all income levels.	
	1-363		taxing second properties having greater levies or stamp duties or whatever, the majority of people are doing that so now what you have is foreign workers here buying properties and entering the Airbnb market and all of that.	This is outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	1-364		if a Caymanian goes to purchase one of those places for example, the fee then is too high for them to purchase it as housing. So then it would be purchased by people who want to use it as a second place but for rental business.	This is outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	1-365	1.6 - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	"Efficient" use of Lands must be defined. It is entirely possible and highly likely that the concept of more "efficient" use of lands in the Proposal is the trend towards more high-rise residential buildings. i.e Tenements as seen in major cities of the world. These are known to be the breeding grounds of poverty and crime and known as "The Projects" in many cities. We DO NOT want the same in Cayman!!	This is explained in section 2.3 of the draft Planning Statement document. Efficient use of land is about preventing low density sprawl and encouraging a mix of building types, rather than allowing single-storey properties in areas with high accessibility.	
	1-366	1.6 - TRANSPORTATION	The objective is not SMART. It must be.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-367	1.6 - CLIMATE RESILIENCE	The objective is not SMART. It must be.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-368		Amend "Incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies" and add "in the development decision making process".	This objective / goal relates to the preparation of plans and policies, as well as decision-making processes and so the current wording is considered adequate.	
	1-369		Support its inclusion.	Noted	
	1-370	1.6 - NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	The objective is not SMART. It must be.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-371		Support.	Noted	
	1-372	1.6 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	If Economy can legally be included in the Plan, then the statement shall read "improve the physical, social, environmental and economic condition of Caymanians."	The plan represents the needs of the whole community, existing wording is considered adequate	
	1-373		The objective is not SMART. It must be	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-374	1.6 - INFRASTRUCTURE	The objective is not SMART. It must be	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u>
	1-375		No over-road walkways. That madness I see along Seven Mile Beach Road now; twenty feet above the road. Nothing within 40 feet. We shouldn't allow anything lower than forty feet to be built across the road. Do you know that if you try to bring down a sailboat with a sail, you can't get across old West Bay Road and you can't get across the new one, unless you go in to Dart Development? What a madness, which genius it was that gave them permission to do that?	Noted. Projects of this nature are considered in consultation with all statutory authorities. Should any detailed policies be required regarding these issues, they would be considered and included at Area Plan stage	
	1-376		Does anyone here tonight know what removes us from third world status? We are still a third world country; can you tell me what removes us from that? It is very simple, The WHO World Health Organization dictates what is: Sewer and public water supply to every resident in your country; that's the only thing we got left to do, sewer to all the people in the country. Right now, the only people that have it is West Bay, West Bay Road, part of George Town and North Sound. We need to go these guys; we need to sewer plan that connects everyone so that we can realize our hard sought economic prosperity is matched by removal from some of these ironic lists that we got like third world status. We need to be removed from that and we need development for our people. If we did it, all our water lenses today, if we did it 30 years ago when we started the Water Authority, our water lenses would be perfect for us to do developments and farming throughout the Island. Right now, the only ones that still exist that are good are in the Eastern District; and guess what? They are still allowing people to build septic tanks and pour their affluent down in the ground.	Section 5.5 of the draft Planning Statement acknowledges the need for alternatives to individual septic tanks to deal with wastewater	
	1-377		Support.	Noted	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-378	1.6 - COMMUNITY FACILITIES	The objective is not SMART. It must be.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u> Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section
	1-379		This should be changed to “Community Zones” as the CPA/DCB is not in the business of providing facilities.	Section 3.6 of the draft Planning Statements concerns Community Zones. This objective / goal in section 1.6 may be achieved in more ways than just providing appropriate zones. Certain decisions or regulation amendments may be necessary at some stage to help to achieve this, and so the current wording is considered appropriate.	
WR22	1-380		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR23	1-381		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	1-382		For the first time, the Plan covers the entire jurisdiction, including all three islands. Such approach recognizes changes due to time and the aspirations of people from all islands, likely enhancing perceptions of a comprehensive and inclusive planning approach.	Noted	
	1-383		Again, for the first time, in a single initiative the project plan / structure takes a comprehensive approach to planning from “strategic” [the Development and Planning Act (the Act), National Planning Framework and 2024 Planning Statement], “tactical” (the Development and Planning Regulations), and “operational” (Area Plans).	Noted	
	1-384		The continuous cycle of review within the planning time frame is a fresh approach recognising “change as the only constant”. This agile and more proactive methodology addressing opportunities and challenges should serve the interest of the vast majority of stakeholders.	Noted	
	1-385		The Draft Planning Statement is relatively user-friendly to the public / stakeholders. It is succinct and easy to digest / comprehend, with not too many technical terms. KUDOS to whoever was involved with generating the draft!	Noted	
	1-386		Amend the TABLE OF CONTENTS to move the ‘Vision’ and ‘Strategic Objectives’ (in the interest of user-friendliness, rename the later to ‘Goals’) forward to ‘1.2’ and ‘1.3’ respectively and renumber various parts (i.e. Development Plan Review Cycle becomes ‘1.4’, and so on). This could be done as part of “tidying up” after all feedback received.	Acknowledged, this change can be incorporated.	Amend order of section 1
	1-387		Recommendation re Paragraph 1. Amend Paragraph 1 to include reference to the Constitution. See recommended language below. ‘This Planning Statement is formulated under the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision), informed by all relevant parts of the Constitution, including sections 15 and 18.’	Acknowledged	Amend section 1.1 as follows: "This Planning Statement is formulated under the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision), <u>informed by all relevant parts of the Constitution, including sections 15 and 18.</u> "
	1-388		Recommendation re Paragraph 6. Considering the change to include the Sister Islands, amend the last sentence to add the word ‘Islands’. Accordingly, it is recommended that in the 1st sentence of paragraph 6 delete ‘Plan Cayman’ and replace it with ‘Plan Cayman Islands’	Plan Cayman is the name of the development plan for the Cayman Islands. Changing to 'Plan Cayman Islands' could foster confusion from a lack of consistency.	
	1-389		The introduction provides an excellent overview of the inception and subsequent Development Plan reviews (whether finalised or not). Informed by known challenges over decades, it may be necessary to amend the Act shortly after completion of this initiative to avoid loss opportunity addressing current significant challenges / gaps (see examples with corresponding recommendations below). Example re existing mandated 5-year Plan review cycle. As background, current international norms include many national plan timeframes spanning 10 to 20 years. To be given a chance to be effective, strategic documents (vision, strategic objectives, goals, etc.) should be comprehensively reviewed no less frequently than every 10 years (current requirement per the Act is every 5 years), while allowing for interim / limited amendments where later seen necessary (already built in to the Act). Reasons for 10-years:	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-390		Heavy lifting - (significant resources, focus) is required for the Development Plan review, while juggling other challenges (in effect boiling down to unrealistic expectations proven by review history).	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-391		“Moving the needle” - addressing long-standing challenges and realising outcomes takes time. This is recognised internationally, with timeframes for national plans commonly ranging from 10 to 20 years. The current 5-year cycle does not provide sufficient time to put in place initiatives, then monitor and evaluate outcome changes.	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-392		While any national plan is constitutionally mandated to be enabled by the government of the day, public sentiment generally is that national plans should not be “political”. The current 5-year cycle is close to the political 4-year general election cycle. Lengthening the period should make the process less “political”.	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-393		The Draft Planning Statement (per page 6) embraces sustainability, which by definition includes (not explicitly stated) planning as best as feasible for future generations. Moving to a longer (10-year) planning horizon would recognise the need for more longer-term planning considering population projections and other relevant factors, such as carrying capacity using diverse scenarios.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	1-394		Relevant current Cabinet approved national policies should inform the planning zones and other components of this Planning Statement. Examples – among others – include: the Food & Nutrition Security Policy, highly relevant to the Agriculture zone; and the National Energy Policy (could inform a few parts of the Planning Statement). Accordingly, see Recommendation C below.	The Planning Statement is a follow on document from the National Planning Framework and both documents were informed by Cabinet approved national policies.	Consider adding list of approved National Policies as an appendix to the Planning Statement.
	1-395		A re DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW CYCLE change to 10 years.		
	1-396		Informed by well-known challenges of a 5-year Plan review cycle insert new paragraphs at ‘1.2’ (draft wording suggested below can be condensed). ‘Current international norms include many national plan timeframes spanning 10 to 20 years (or even longer). Heavy lifting (significant resources, focus) is required for the Development Plan review, requiring substantial funding in an atmosphere of strained resources. Moving the needle addressing long-standing challenges takes time.. The current 5-year cycle does not provide sufficient time to develop and put in place Area Plans, and monitor / evaluate outcome changes. While any national plan is constitutionally mandated to be enabled by the government of the day, public sentiment generally is that national plans should not be “political”. The current 5-year cycle is close to the political 4-year general election cycle. Lengthening the period should make the process less political. The Draft Planning Statement (per page 6) embraces sustainability, which by definition includes time (i.e. planning as best as feasible for future generations). Moving to a longer (10-year) planning horizon would recognise the need for more longer-term planning considering population projections and other relevant factors.	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-397		Strategic documents (vision, strategic objectives, goals, etc.) to be given a chance to be effective should be comprehensively reviewed no less frequently than every 10 years, while allowing for interim amendments where necessary (already built in). Accordingly, due to the significant challenges adhering to a 5-year Plan review cycle and for justifiable reasons mentioned above, at the conclusion of the current review process, consideration will be given to expanding the review cycle to 10-years.’		
	1-398		Recommendation B re DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW CYCLE.		
	1-399		Informed by the above, revise the existing paragraph at ‘1.2’ by: relocating it to below the above inserts, and revising it to account for a 10-year review cycle, while still keeping ongoing area plan reviews.	Noted. Amendment to the Development and Planning Act is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	1-400		Recommendation C re DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW CYCLE.		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR24	1-401		Add a sentence after the existing 1st sentence in paragraph 1, as follows – Toward enhancing synergy and minimizing duplication of effort, Planning Statement reviews shall be informed by relevant current Cabinet approved national policies.’	Acknowledged	Amend section 1.2, as follows: "The structure of PlanCayman, where Area Plans are prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5-year plan review period, allows for a process of continuous review and community engagement. <u>Toward enhancing synergy and minimizing duplication of effort, Planning Statement reviews shall be informed by relevant current Cabinet approved national policies.</u> This enables the plan review process to be more responsive to changing pressures and the needs of the community and invites public involvement on a more regular basis. The intention is that this will make the plan review more accountable to the community and provide greater clarity about how individuals can contribute to the process and..."
	1-402		Observations re Figure 1.1 Figure 1.1 captures well the entire initiative, including key hierarchical (yet interconnected at any level) components. In line with ‘1.2’s assertion on ‘...responding to changing pressures and the needs of the community...’, it should be clear to the insufficiently informed that the Act and the Regulations can be amended as necessary. Accordingly, this could be noted in the Figure. Add a note to the right (pointing to the Act and the Regulations) stating - ‘Informed by feedback and recommendations resulting from review of the Planning Statement or any other component of Figure 1.1., the Act and / or the Regulations may be amended as necessary’.	Acknowledged	Add * note below figure or use arrow suggestion
	1-403	1.3 Structure of the Planning Statement	EXCELLENTLY WRITTEN! Others may differ in opinion. No further observations re paragraphs.	Noted	
	1-404		Minor formatting recommendations. For ease of reference, label the illustrations on the left side of page 4 (e.g. Figure 1.3.1 and Figure 1.3.2 to correspond with the subheadings).	Acknowledged	Add suggested text
	1-405		Observation re Paragraphs 1-4 on page 4 EXCELENTLY WRITTEN! Others may differ in opinion.	Noted	
	1-406		Existing ELECTORAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES should be used as the boundary for area plans (see below Recommendation re last paragraph under item ‘1.4’). Reasons:	The indicative Area Plan boundaries were used to better represent character within the Cayman Islands; more so evident on Grand Cayman. Whilst electoral boundaries will promote identity amongst districts, it does not adequately represent character that often times overlap within electoral boundaries e.g. Industrial Area.	
	1-407		Existing electoral districts already have their distinct identities. Despite best of intentions, having area plans not following such boundaries could be viewed as diluting such identities (even if unintentional).	The indicative Area Plan boundaries were used to better represent character within the Cayman Islands; more so evident on Grand Cayman. Whilst electoral boundaries will promote identity amongst districts, it does not adequately represent character that often times overlap within electoral boundaries e.g. Industrial Area.	
	1-408		To move towards realising the benefits of districts becoming more self-sufficient while George Town moves toward decentralization. This in part would mean weaning away from the notion that Grand Cayman districts are suburbs of George Town. BENEFITS include (by no means a comprehensive list below): a)Employment and recreation nearby within districts b)Opens up more opportunity for investment and entrepreneurship in each district c)Less traffic jams to and from George Town, positively impacting quality of life, boosting productivity (less time in traffic, more time working), while mitigating transportation infrastructure cost to the government d)Increased pedestrianization and by extension better public health while reducing health costs to government and individuals e)Reinforcing sense of community	The indicative Area Plan boundaries were used to better represent character within the Cayman Islands; more so evident on Grand Cayman. Whilst electoral boundaries will promote identity amongst districts, it does not adequately represent character that often times overlap within electoral boundaries e.g. Industrial Area.	
	1-409		Observations re timing of Area Plans		
	1-410		AREA PLANS FOR DISTRICTS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED CONCURRENTLY versus sequentially (not as illustrated in the current draft Area Plan map, see above observations re why for districts). This will require more resources [identifiable in a recommended (see observations and relevant recommendation below at ‘Strategic Objectives’)] supporting IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. Reasons:		
	1-411		EQUITY WHILE RECOGNISING DISTRICT DIFFERENCES. If district area plans are developed sequentially (i.e. one after the other or 2 at a time), there will likely be after-the-fact concerns regarding a particular district (or 2) being given 1st preference over others (perception of second class citizens / residents). Justifying the sequential approach – with the best of intentions – could be problematic.	Two Area Plans per year is an indicative timeframe, acknowledging that some Area Plans will be more complex than others. Resources can also be allocated to the process as necessary to ensure progress is maintained	
		1.4 Area Plans			

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-412		SYNERGY BETWEEN DISTRICT AREA PLANS. If district area plans are developed sequentially (i.e. one after the other, or 2 at a time), there will likely be after-the-fact concerns regarding loss opportunity to borrow from each other as necessary. The concurrent approach would address this issue.	Each Area Plan will be prepared in full consultation with infrastructure providers, allowing for consideration of how each Area Plan fits within wider strategic infrastructure plans.	
	1-413		COMPREHENSIVELY INFORM SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS, rather than an unintended “piecemeal” approach. Area Plans will inform relevant documents up and down (e.g. the Act, Regulations and supporting policies). Doing so more fully (i.e. takes time to frequently amend the Act and Regulations) can only occur if Area Plans are done concurrently.	The most effective means of having the Development and Planning Regulations updated upon completion of each Area Plan is being considered. Ultimately, each Area will have tailored Development and Planning Regulations to support the policies and Zoning Map for each Area Plan.	
	1-414		<u>Recommendation re inserting paragraph before the last one at ‘1.4 AREA PLANS’</u> It is intended that Area Plans will be developed concurrently to the extent feasible to take advantage of synergy between Area Plans, promote equity between districts and to fully inform the Act and Regulations, see above observations re timing of Area Plans.	Unless otherwise instructed by Ministry of PAHITD, the CPA, DCB and the DoP will maintain the current sequential format.	
	1-415		<u>Recommendation re last paragraph on page 4</u> Delete the 2nd (last) sentence. See relevant observations above.	The CPA, DCB and DoP have agreed to maintain the use of the indicative boundaries instead of electoral district boundaries.	
	1-416		Area Plans boundaries should be the same as those for district boundaries		
	1-417		Special Area Plans can be done for Seven Mile Beach, Industrial Area, Central Mangrove Wetland, or any other ‘special’ area.		
	1-418		The note in parenthesis at the bottom of the map should be expanded to indicate that ‘in the interest of moving toward district self-sufficiency, it is anticipated that each electoral district will have PaDs.’	It is not the role of the Planning Statement, or Area Plans, to determine the location and number of PADs. PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed.	
	1-419		Delete ‘INNER SUBURB’ and ‘OUTER SUBURB’	The proposed indicative Area Plan boundaries are considered to be suitable since they reflect broad character areas although it is acknowledged that small amendments to the boundary lines could be considered. During Area Plan preparation the community/stakeholders may confirm Area Plan names.	
	1-420		Minor formatting recommendations. For ease of reference, revise the label for the illustration on page 5 to ‘Figure 1.4’ to correspond with the relevant topic on page 4 (i.e. ‘1.4 Area Plans’).	Acknowledged	Figure numbers will be updated as necessary.
	1-421		At the end of the 1st sentence in the last paragraph of page 4 (i.e. change ‘Figure 1.2’ to ‘Figure 1.4’).	Acknowledged	Figure numbers will be updated as necessary.
	1-422	1.5 Vision	Informed by best practices crafting visions (see above samples), the ‘VISION’ in the Draft Planning Statement (as taken from 2023’s National Planning Framework) is actually an excellently crafted ‘VISION STATEMENT’, not a ‘Vision’. Due to its “wordiness”, no one is likely to memorise it, hence, it’s unintentionally ineffective on what should be driving the initiative. To its significant credit, it could be a superb base for crafting an easy to memorise (succinct) and motivational Vision.	Noted, see below	
	1-423		<u>Recommendations regarding the VISION</u>		
	1-424		A. Change the title of the existing ‘Vision’ to ‘Vision Statement’ in both the National Planning Framework and the Planning Statement. The former document should not be considered “cast in stone” since it hasn’t been formally adopted.	Acknowledged. This amendment can be incorporated.	Amend section 1.5 (and other references in text and contents), as follows: "1.5 Vision Statement The general vision statement of the Plan is to... ...This vision statement is adapted from that..."
	1-425		B. Use the ‘Vision Statement’ (see ‘A’ above) to craft a succinct and easy to memorise / embed VISION (see examples above). This could be done via – for instance – a short (e.g. 2 weeks) competition based on set criteria, such as those outlined above. Submissions meeting the criteria would be voted on to achieve consensus on what the Vision should be. This approach would further reinforce the inclusive approach undertaken thus far, enhancing partnership and buy-in	Noted. However, its likely that each Area Plan will include a succinct vision for that Area, the creation of which could form part of public consultation.	
	1-426		The circled blurb at page 6 titled SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT could also be used to inform a succinct vision, such as ‘Securing a Sustainable Future’ or ‘Securing Sustainability’. These examples (could be many others after a competition) are aspirational (‘Sustainable Future’ or ‘sustainability’), realistic (securing, we are not there yet), shows commitment (securing), is easy to memorise and embed (only 2-4 words), and could be seen as the catalyst for what should be the supporting (existing, wordy) Vision Statement.	Noted. However, its likely that each Area Plan will include a succinct vision for that Area, the creation of which could form part of public consultation.	
	1-427		<u>Observations re Strategic Objectives</u>		
	1-428		WELL DONE! The 7 Strategic Objectives Strategic appear to cover high level needs while not being an epistle. Striking this balance well (as done) enhances the aspirational components of the Plan, while enhancing its user-friendliness.	Noted	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-429	1.6 Strategic Objectives	'Strategic Objectives' is a technical term no longer recommended in national documents (legislation, policies, plans, etc.). Reason: combining 'Strategic' (high level outcome or goal oriented) with 'Objectives' [which should be 'SMART' (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely)] is contradictory. From the draft wording of the 'Strategic Objectives', clearly the term is inaccurate and inappropriate (though unintentional) for the intended purpose. A more publicly acceptable (user-friendly) term is 'Goals'.	Noted	
	1-430		Rename 'Strategic Objectives' to 'Goals' wherever the term appears in the Planning Statement. See rationale at 2nd paragraph above under 'Observations re Strategic Objectives'.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives.	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES GOALS Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section
	1-431		Concern has been expressed that the Goals (termed 'Strategic Objectives' in the draft Planning Statement) are currently written in a way that they can't be measured (i.e. How can efficiency and effectiveness be measured, How can accountability be ensured?), A public IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FRAMEWORK can mitigate this concern covering strategic, tactical and operational DELIVERABLES (the Vision, Vision Statement, SMART objectives, actions), likely necessary resources, timeframe, progress / success indicators, monitoring, evaluation and change as necessary. See Recommendation B below.	Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	
	1-432		Because the existing high-level verbiage isn't measurable (rightly so for this part of the document), an IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FRAMEWORK (as an Appendix to the Planning Statement) is crucial toward ensuring efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. Such Framework could be a simple one page table (to be populated in a different timeframe via a collaborative effort) covering: the Vision (the aspirational "be all and end all", see above recommendation to revise the current draft Vision); Vision Statement (existing 'Vision' recommended to be termed 'Vision Statement' for reasons mentioned above); Goals (now termed 'Strategic Objectives', see above reasons for recommendation to change this to 'Goals'); SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely), actions, likely necessary resources, timeframe, progress / success indicators, monitoring, evaluation and change as necessary.	Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	
	1-433		To enhance effectiveness delivering desired outcomes, use synergy between GOALS ('Strategic Objectives'). For instance, re synergy between transportation and housing, higher residential density near mayor road corridors would stimulate a market for public transportation while mitigating sprawl and support benefits of pedestrianism. Another example (considering limited land space) would be to allow diverse uses on the same land, such as certain types of agriculture at solar farms.	Section 1.6 refers to the need for collaboration between agencies. Also, the structure of the Planning Statement, whereby it incorporated "Other Policy Considerations" that relate to all projects / applications, ensures synergy between policies.	
	1-434		Add a sentence at the end of the 1st paragraph under 1.6 as follows - 'Use synergy between Goals to enhance the effectiveness of desired outcomes.'		
	1-435		Paragraph one of Item 1.6 in the Draft Planning Statement covers well and succinctly the definition of 'sustainability' (i.e. economic, social and environmental) and related matters. That being said, the beginning of the 2nd paragraph (focusing on 'economic' is inconsistent with the 1st paragraph. To be consistent, it should read 'Achieving sustainability requires...' rather than 'Achieving a sustainable economy...'. In the 1st sentence of the 2nd paragraph under 1.6 delete the words 'a sustainable economy' and replace them with 'sustainability'.	Noted	
	1-436		The existing 'Goal' ('Strategic' Objective' in the current draft Planning Statement) is really well written. The terms used can be expanded with a few additional key terms informed by significant concerns (e.g. affordability, accessibility, inclusionary). Also, informed by the current housing "crisis", the term 'Encourage' may be viewed as too soft / mild / uncommitted / "iffy". Would recommend a more "committed" word, such as 'Support', 'Advance', 'Stimulate' or 'Secure'.	Acknowledged	Amend section 1.6, as follows: "Achieving a sustainable economy sustainability requires..."
	1-437		Amend the existing Goal ('Strategic Objective') to 'Support the availability of affordable, accessible, inclusionary and appropriate mix of housing for the whole community.'	Noted	
	1-438		TRANSPORTATION REALLY WELL THOUGHT OUT! Most key terms included (e.g. convenient, reliable, safe and accessible). Others may differ in opinion. That being said, affordability is also on many people's minds, and will likely remain so for the foreseeable future. Would recommend that the term 'affordable' be included.	Acknowledged	Add suggested text as follows: 'Support the availability of an appropriate mix of affordable, accessible and inclusionary housing for the whole community.'
	1-439		Amend the Goal ('Strategic Objective') to end with '...convenient, reliable, safe, affordable and accessible.'		
	1-440		Minor formatting recommendation to give the illustration at page 5 an ID, e.g. Figure 1.6 to correspond with the topic.	Acknowledged	Amend section 1.6: "Transportation - Support greater transportation choices that are sustainable for a growing population while being convenient, reliable, safe, affordable and accessible".
	1-441			Acknowledged	Update all figures in Planning Statement to reflect a figure #.
WR25	1-442		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR26	1-443		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR27	1-444	1.3 - STRUCTURE OF THE PLANNING STATEMENT	The broad structure presented in the Planning Statement seems appropriate; however, it is difficult to evaluate the interactivity between the proposed Planning Zones, Overlay Zones, and specific application and modifications to the proposed Area Plans without more development around the latter. The indicative Area Plans and boundaries, while helpful, do not illustrate the anticipated Planning Zones and Overlay Zones based on the proposed definitions in the draft Planning Statement. Equally, while it should be recognized that any such designation would be preliminary and subject to detailed change as activities progress, having no baseline for initial evaluation and comment makes it difficult to determine the indicative scoping and whether the proposed structure hierarchy is appropriate to purpose.	Noted. The preparation of Area Plans is the next stage in the process and this is where the Zones and Overlays will be applied to each parcel	
	1-445	1.3.3	While touched upon as aspects of certain policy categorization details in Section 5 (e.g. points within Infrastructure, Design and Natural Resources and Coastline), there does not appear to be an appropriately focused emphasis on Sustainability and Resiliency as policy considerations. It is arguable that this category (Sustainability and Resiliency) should be raised to be on level footing with other policy categories, rather than as detail aspects within the current policy categories.	One of the Strategic Objectives of the draft Planning Statement is 'Climate Resilience: Incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies'. Policies relating to Climate Change are incorporated throughout the draft Planning Statement, including: - <u>Section 3.8: Open Space Zones</u> : Preserve land for public enjoyment and protect them from non-recreational development - <u>Section 3.9: Coastal Mangrove Buffer</u> : Ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development - <u>Section 4.2: Natural Resource Preservation Overlay</u> : Ensure development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features - <u>Section 4.6: Sensitive Coastline Overlay</u> - control development of highly vulnerable coastal areas and incorporate appropriate building, site and landscape design - <u>Section 5.4: Circulation and Transportation</u> : Support existing and future public transport operations and encourage conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel. - <u>Section 5.6: Design</u> Encourage resilient design as a protective measure against climate change, storm surge and sever weather events - <u>Section 5.7: Natural Resources and Coastline</u> : Minimise the impact of major development on the natural environment, ensure developments in coastal areas incorporate hazard risk reduction mechanisms	
	1-446	1.4 - AREA PLANS	Per the description of this section, it would be helpful to evaluate the proposed Area Plans and boundaries in the context of the key area-specific needs and objectives envisioned for each location. While reference is made regarding certain objectives and issues for focus, there is no attribution, indicative or otherwise, of what those objectives may be for any specific proposed Area Plan. As such, it would be highly challenging to evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed boundaries, for example, without viewing the same in context to the ascribed key issues and objectives associated with the land therein. It would be reasonable to provide a similar level of initial development to the Area Plans as has been completed for the proposed Planning Zones and Overlay Zones.	Noted. Since consultation and data gathering will form a key part of the preparation of each Area Plan it is considered premature to identify the key objectives for each Area at this stage. The point is noted regarding evaluation of the boundaries, but at this stage they have been determined based on broad character areas.	
	1-447		The Planning Statement promotes the use of sustainable development principles; however, it does not consider how population growth could negatively impact - and significantly derail progress on achieving - the 7 key strategic objectives areas the planning statement. It was voiced as a concern by a few persons who attended public meetings that population projections and carrying capacity is not considered in the Planning Statement but should be. Limits to growth in other areas such as the economy is also not considered. Physical limits must be factored into any plan that seeks sustainable outcomes. <i>Recommend to include in the Planning Statement that the CPA will work with the relevant Ministries / Departments (e.g., Ministry of Planning, Infrastructure, Housing, Border Control and Labour) to address the causes of Cayman's exponential population growth (e.g., immigration) in order to: manage this growth and resulting developments and impacts on infrastructure and the economy; and to determine the carrying capacity of the Cayman Islands.</i>	Noted. The CPA and Department of Planning will work with other Ministries / Departments throughout the preparation of PlanCayman. The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	1-448		Adding social first in this section promotes the government's commitment to its people before the economy. <i>Recommend the CPA change "economic, social and environmental outcomes while safeguarding the culture" to, "social, economic and environmental outcomes while safeguarding Caymanian Heritage" in this section and throughout the document, as to put the social concerns ahead of the economy. Also repeated elsewhere in this document.</i>	Noted. This suggestion can be incorporated	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: <i>"Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic- social and- environmental <u>and economic</u> outcomes, while safeguarding <u>Caymanian Heritage</u>, the culture , <u>and the</u> health and general welfare of its people."</i>
	1-449		This section is vague and how the Plan enables this secondary objective is unclear: "Achieving a sustainable economy requires collaboration between the government, businesses, the community and individuals. As such, a secondary objective of the Planning Statement is to provide for and encourage better coordination and cooperation among all interested entities, be they private or public." By definition, an Objective is a specific and measurable action that is related to a goal. Recommend reviewing this section and incorporating relevant, sufficient, and SMART Objectives, including how these "objectives" relate to the National Planning Framework document.	Noted. Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 <u>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES GOALS</u> Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	1-450	1.6	Housing Objective - Recommend amending the section to read “Encourage the development of a diverse range of housing options including affordable homes, that are climate resilient and compatible with the character and needs of the existing neighborhood.”	<p>The existing reference to 'whole community' is considered to be sufficiently inclusive to include affordable homes. Section 3.2 also refers to housing options for all income levels.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include reference to climate resilience in this section since climate resilience is another strategic objective / goal just below and will apply to all forms of development.</p> <p>Reference to compatible with the character and needs of the existing neighbourhood is overly restrictive for a strategic objective / goal and may prevent new housing types (such as missing middle housing, townhomes etc) in appropriate locations but which the existing character is low-rise and low density</p>	
	1-451		Transportation – Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Greenhouse Gas Emission Targets for Ground Transportation: 35% Green House Gas emission reduction by 2030, 90% Green House Gas emission reduction by 2045.	Appreciate the suggestion. However this seems overly specific for a broad transportation objective / goal which relates to all forms of transport (including walking and cycling etc etc)	
	1-452		Climate Resilience - The Climate Resilience objective does not mention climate mitigation or adaptation. Recommend amending the section to read “Support locally appropriate mitigation and adaptation measures to reduce climate risk to the society, economy and environment”	Noted. This section can be amended to incorporate the suggestion	Amend section 1.6 "Climate Resilience' as follows: <i>"incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies Support locally appropriate mitigation and adaptation measures to reduce climate risk to the society, economy and environment "</i>
	1-453		Climate Resilience – Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Renewable Energy Targets: 30% renewable energy penetration by 2030, 70% renewable energy penetration by 2037, 100% renewable energy penetration by 2045.	Appreciate the suggestion. However this seems overly detailed for a broad objective / goal which relates to all forms of climate resilience and adaptation.	
	1-454		Natural Environment - The use of 'wildlife' in the Natural Environment aspect inadvertently omits plant species. Recommend changing and removing the word wildlife and inserting 'flora and fauna'. Also, recommend highlighting 'marine and terrestrial' and changing 'habitats' to 'ecosystems'. “Promote and secure Biological diversity and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources while conserving endangered, threatened, and endemic flora and fauna and protecting their ecosystems”	Noted. This section can be amended to incorporate the suggestion regarding ecosystems. 'Wildlife' however is considered suitable since its reflects plants and animals.	Amend section 1.6 'Natural Environment' as follows: <i>"Promote and secure biological diversity and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources while conserving endangered, threatened and endemic wildlife and protecting their habitats ecosystems "</i>
	1-455		Economic Development – Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Electric Vehicles Targets: - Light-duty New Vehicle Sales & Imports: o 30% from EVs by 2030 o 100% from EVs by 2045 - Heavy-duty New Vehicle Sales & Imports: o 30% from EVs by 2030 o 100% from EVs by 2045	Appreciate the suggestion. However this seems overly detailed for a broad objective / goal which relates to all forms of economic development.	
	1-456		Infrastructure: Suggest including 'resilient' in the Infrastructure aspect. Recommended change “Support the provision of sustainable and resilient infrastructure”	Noted. This section can be amended to incorporate the suggestion	Amend section 1.6 'Infrastructure' as follows: <i>"Support the provision of sustainable and resilient infrastructure necessary for the efficient functioning and growth of a modern society while maintaining a safe environment that safeguards health and general welfare "</i>
	1-457		Infrastructure - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Targets: - Electricity Supply: o 30% emissions reduction over 2019 levels by 2030 o 100% emissions reductions by 2045	Appreciate the suggestion. However this seems overly detailed for a broad objective / goal which relates to all forms of infrastructure.	
	1-458		Community Facilities - Suggest adding 'equitable' ahead of 'access'. Also suggest adding: “outdoor recreation, green spaces, and the natural environment”. Recommend the sentence to be reworded as “education facilities as well as equitable access to outdoor recreation, green spaces, and the natural environment.”	Noted. This section can be amended to incorporate the suggestion regarding equitable. Green spaces are considered to be reflected by 'natural environment'.	Amend section 1.6 "Community Facilities, as follows: <i>"Promote a healthy and inclusive society through provision of community, health and education facilities as well as equitable access to outdoor recreation and the natural environment "</i>
	1-459	1.4	(Pg. 4) 1.4 - Area plans. Its purpose is to ensure that the character and natural features of areas across Cayman are preserved by allowing policy flexibility in the decision-making process for development applications. Recommend the CPA implement immediate interim policy measures to limit further changes to the character of areas until the Area Plans are complete. Given the fast rate of development, the purpose of area plans will quickly become irrelevant	<p>Section 1.2 explains that the structure of PlanCayman, where Area Plans are prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5-year plan review period, allows for a process of continuous review and community engagement. This enables the plan review process to be more responsive to changing pressures and the needs of the community and invites public involvement on a more regular basis. The intention is that this will make the plan review more accountable to the community and provide greater clarity about how individuals can contribute to the process and have more of a say in the future of their neighbourhood.</p> <p>The suggested 'interim policy measures' would still require 2-month public consultation and Parliament approval and so cannot be prepared as quickly as suggested.</p>	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	1-460	Figure 1.2	(Pg.5) Figure 1.2. The 'industrial', 'inner suburb', and 'outer suburb' names have the potential to be counterproductive by categorising areas based on their current usage rather than the potential for future usage. They also strip these areas of their local identity. Strongly recommend these names be returned to place-based names rather than usage-based names.	The proposed indicative Area Plan boundaries are considered to be suitable since they reflect broad character areas although it is acknowledged that small amendments to the boundary lines could be considered. During Area Plan preparation the community/stakeholders may confirm Area Plan names.	
	1-461	1.5	(pg.6) 1.5 Vision. Currently, the vision of the Plan is to: "Maintain and enhance the quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic, social and environmental outcomes while safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people." This seems to place the economy ahead of social concerns. Recommend the CPA change the order to, "social, economic and environmental outcomes" in this section and throughout the document.	Noted. This change has been recommended for inclusion (see above).	
WR29	1-462		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR30	1-463		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR31	1-464		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR32	1-465		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR33	1-466		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	2-001		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF2	2-002		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF3	2-003		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF4	2-004		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF5	2-005		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	2-006		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF7	2-007		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	2-008		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF9	2-009		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF10	2-010		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF11	2-011		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	2-012		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	2-013		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	2-014		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF15	2-015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	2-016		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	2-017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	2-018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	2-019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF20	2-020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	2-021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF22	2-022		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF23	2-023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF24	2-024		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF25	2-025		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF26	2-026		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	2-027		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	2-028		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF29	2-029		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF30	2-030		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	2-031		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	2-032		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	2-033		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF34	2-034		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	2-035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF36	2-036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	2-037		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	2-038		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF39	2-039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF40	2-040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	2-041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	2-042		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF43	2-043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF44	2-044		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	2-045		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	2-046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF47	2-047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF48	2-048		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF49	2-049		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF50	2-050		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF51	2-051		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF52	2-052		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF53	2-053		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF54	2-054		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	2-055		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	2-056		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	2-057		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	2-058		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	2-059		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF60	2-060		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF61	2-061		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF62	2-062		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF63	2-063		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF64	2-064		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF65	2-065		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF66	2-066		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF67	2-067		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF68	2-068		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF69	2-069		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF70	2-070		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF71	2-071		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	2-072		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF73	2-073		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF74	2-074		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF75	2-075		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF76	2-076		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	2-077		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF78	2-078		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF79	2-079		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF80	2-080		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF81	2-081		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF82	2-082		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	2-083		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	2-084		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF85	2-085		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF86	2-086		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF87	2-087		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF88	2-088		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF89	2-089		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF90	2-090		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF91	2-091		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF92	2-092		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF93	2-093		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF94	2-094		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF95	2-095		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF96	2-096		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF97	2-097		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF98	2-098		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF99	2-099		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF100	2-100		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF101	2-101		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF102	2-102		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF103	2-103		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF104	2-104		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF105	2-105		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF106	2-106		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF107	2-107		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF108	2-108		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF109	2-109		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF110	2-110		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF111	2-111		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF112	2-112		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF113	2-113		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF114	2-114		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF115	2-115		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF116	2-116		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF117	2-117		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF118	2-118		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	2-119		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	2-120		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF121	2-121		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF122	2-122		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF123	2-123		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF124	2-124		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	2-125		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	2-126		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF127	2-127		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF192	2-192		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF193	2-193		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF194	2-194		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF195	2-195		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF196	2-196		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF197	2-197		2.1 Introduction Suggestion it to change the wording in the second paragraph of this section to read as below: Cayman represents a unique situation where a small population has grown significantly around the opportunities presented by global economies. The role of the Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and to articulate ways to achieve high quality-of-life standards, all whilst considering the differing needs of our three islands and their communities. I am making this suggestion of wording change because I believe it should be further clarified and noted that there are differing needs across our islands; this cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach.	Noted. However, the suggestion is reflected in the Area Plan approach which enables national objectives and policies to be implemented in a manner that is applicable to individual locations (see section 1.4 of the draft Planning Statement).	
	2-198		Figure 2.1 My suggestion here would be to include a breakdown with the inclusion of additional lines on the graph provided to show the population growth by island (grand/brac/little).	Noted. Where available from Economics and Statistics Office, this data can be included for each Area Plan	
	2-199		2.6 Maintaining a Successful Economy. I would suggest changing the current sentence to read as follows: "These industries need to be supported by providing the necessary facilities, built environment and preserving the natural environment necessary for them to prosper."	Noted, however the Planning Statement includes policies relating to Natural Resources (section 5.7) which would be considered for all type of development.	
FF198	2-200		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF199	2-201		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF200	2-202		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF201	2-203		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF202	2-204		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF203	2-205		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF204	2-206		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF205	2-207		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF206	2-208		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF207	2-209		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF208	2-210		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF209	2-211		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF210	2-212		2) Section 2.2 Adapting to a growing population (p.7); The Cayman Islands Government needs to get a grip on the country's expeditious population growth. A growth that has been primarily driven by the importation of cheap labour, an importation of low class mindsets, attitudes and ways of living. As stated 'This ever growing population has a huge impact on the built and natural environment, infrastructure, transportation, accommodation, services, etc.'. As a country we need to prioritise our people first - Caymanians - over an influx of an artifical migrant population. Rather than encouraging the population to continue to grow at a rapid rate the Government needs to focus on securing a quality over quantity population. One where Caymanians are secured and not displaced, respected and not disregarded from prejudice attitudes and demeaning behaviour from foreign nationals who have no respect or regard for the country and our Caymanian people.	Immigration policy and population growth is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF211	2-213		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF212	2-214		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	2-215		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF214	2-216		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF215	2-217		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	2-218		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF217	2-219		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF218	2-220		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF219	2-221		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF220	2-222		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF221	2-223		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF222	2-224		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF223	2-225		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF224	2-226		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	2-227		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	2-228		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR1-A	2-229		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR1-B	2-230		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR2	2-231		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	2-232		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR3	2-233		Section 2, Challenges and Opportunities. Each Area will put different emphasis on the nine factors mentioned in this section, and they will interact in different ways. On Little Cayman, Quality of Natural Environment will be highlighted, and will mean managing development to limit population growth to avoid going beyond the capacity of the island while protecting the environment. That can be done in a way consistent with the plan for the Cayman Islands as a whole; preserving the environment on Little Cayman will preserve its attractions for visitors, helping the economy of the Caymans as a whole. Details of how to protect the Natural Environment are best addressed in specification for Planning Zones (next section).	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
WR4	2-234	2.2 Adapting to a growing population	Population growth on LC should be limited. It is a 10 square mile island with a strong economy based on eco-tourism because of its natural environment. Presently, the resident population (people who live here full or part time) is around 200 people. Doubling the population could mean doubling the number of buildings, which would reduce the amount of natural, undeveloped property significantly. A limit should be placed on the number of residents and dwellings on the island so that it is not 10 square miles of concrete in the future. Perhaps the number of dwellings could be capped to support no more than 300 residents. In addition to limiting dwellings, the airport should be made safe, but should not be greatly enlarged over time.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
WR5	2-235		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR6	2-236		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR7	2-237		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR8	2-238		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR9	2-239		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR10	2-240		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR11	2-241		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR12	2-242		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR13	2-243		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR14	2-244		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR15	2-245		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR16	2-246		A graph illustrating population projections would be helpful for the public to understand expected growth. If it can be broken down by district, even more insightful.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	2-247		Where can the C.I. Government ecosystem accounts be found? Suggest links be provided on the PlanCayman website.	Noted. Consider adding list of approved National Policies, and referenced materials, as an appendix to the Planning Statement.	
	2-248		Where can the C.I. Climate Risk Assessment be found? Suggest links be provided on the PlanCayman website.	Noted. Consider adding list of approved National Policies, and referenced materials, as an appendix to the Planning Statement.	
WR17	2-249		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR18	2-250		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR19	2-251		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR20	2-252		Infrastructure and Transportation (Sections 2.9 & 2.10) Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promote the development of sustainable infrastructure and transportation systems, including public transit, cycling, and pedestrian pathways.• Integrate green infrastructure solutions, such as permeable pavements, green roofs, and rainwater harvesting systems, to enhance resilience and reduce environmental impact	Section 2 outlined the challenges and opportunities we face. Other sections of the Planning Statement (e.g. 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) provide greater detail and policies on the issues referenced.	
	2-253		The document does not provide any solutions for this challenge. If you do not propose to solve the problem, why identify it?	The solutions to the challenges and opportunities identified in this section of the Planning Statement can be found in the remaining sections of the document because it reflects the broad range of issues identified in section 2.2,, and will also be tackled within Area Plans	None
	2-254		How do we plan if we do not have a Population Plan or Policy, however we wish to define it. We need to know how many people we are planning for. It is difficult to do a plan for the people if we don't know how many people we are planning for.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-255	2.2 - ADAPTING TO A GROWING POPULATION	Based on data, KE produced a graph showing population growth from 1802-2022. In 1802, we had 933 people; in 1960, 8,500 and by 1970 it had increased to 10,000, an increase of 1,500 in 60's decade. In 1960 Caymanians accounted for 98% and non-Caymanians 2% of the population. However, from 1970 – 1980, there was a rapid increase of over 6,000 people. Between 1980 and 1989 the population increased by almost 10,000 to 25,335. Between 1989 and 2010 the population more than doubled to 54,397, and by 2022 it increased to over 81,000. That's over 30,000 in 12 years. In 2022, Caymanians also became a minority people in their own land - 47.5% Caymanians and 52.5% non-Caymanians. Between 1970 and 2022 our population numbers fluctuated for various reasons some of which are the oil crisis in 1973, the status grants in 2003, and 9-11 and the global financial meltdown during the first decade of this century.	Noted, and acknowledged in section 2.2 of the Planning Statement.	None
	2-256		There is nothing in this section to highlight the loss of heritage and culture which plays into Population so, loss of identity essentially. That's not mentioned at all in this chapter which is very important right now on this island due to the conversation a lot of people are having now.	Noted. Reference can be included within this section to heritage and culture	Amend section 2.2 to state: "This ever growing population has a huge impact on the built and natural environment, infrastructure, transportation, accommodation, services, recreation spaces , <u>heritage</u> , <u>culture</u> and the community of the Cayman Islands ."
	2-257		KE: Couldn't agree more and throughout the entire document that is missing. A few places they mentioned culture but not heritage. I Found that a lot of emphasis has been placed on the economy. It is very important. We all need a growing economy and in my view the document places more emphasis on economy than culture. Further on in the presentation, it talks about letting the private sector control certain things. That is a discussion we should all have of how much influence Government should have on the economy. Different Economist have different ideas as this. Yes, heritage and culture is not highlighted enough in the document.	The Vision(section 1.5) refers to culture and can be amended to include heritage. The Planning Statement includes a Heritage Preservation Overlay (section 4..4)	Amend vision to state: "...while safeguarding the culture, <u>heritage</u> , health and general welfare of..."
	2-258		A quote from the organization of Economic Cooperation and development anyway some large international organization and on that in the years after COVID I think was the 2021 or 2022 we have population growth rate of 13.8% and so they have a listing of countries and territories where that fell on the spectrum , so we had a population growth of 13% /13.8% in that year and rounding up the top eight, I think five of the eight were sub-Saharan African countries or other countries that were very close and approximate to a war zone, so we had large population there - they were 50%/ 60%, and the other three laggards, if my memory serves me correct, were Cayman, TCI and BVI, surprisingly. So those are the Caribbean countries and if you delve a little bit further into those numbers, they were also the countries that were issuing residency by investment Schemes; so, you have this residency, so you have that kind of undercurrent or some sort of mechanism that you can invest in that country and gain citizenship to that country. So that's just kind of putting it out there that perhaps some policies may need to be looked at to kind of curve that off if that is the desire of the political mandate.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-259		Is it too late, talking about Cayman and beyond now, any control, is there any Law that was ever conceived, any policy, that could not be repealed; I am talking about worldwide now, in other countries. For instance, would it be impossible to repeal those status grants that were granted back in the day? Would it be asking too much to have the Government of the day repealing that and say what we are going to do, the 3,000 original grants, we keep them, but all the off shoots of them, we are going to retrack them and repeal them.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-260		Immigration Reform, you had it up there and I looked at it and said you know what immigration reform probably is one of the biggest things that would drive our Plan Cayman; because with the kind of population that I heard you talk about, 500K or 550K, I hope the person that did that is kind of crazy because, we don't have the infrastructure now or by 2050, we are not going to have the infrastructure to support 500,000 people, right. So, my suggestion to that is we need to enact four-year-rollovers. Nobody should be here on a work permit beyond 4 years, no one. That's not how we want to grow our population by having other people come here from other nations to become Caymanians. Encouraged native Caymanians to have more people/children, give us scholarships, give us other stuff that basically encourage us to have bigger families; that's how you grow your population.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-261		The chart below, produced by ██████████, shows that if current population trend (1990-2022) continues unabated by 2052 we could have almost 600,000 people residing in the Islands.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	None
	2-262		I don't think their calculations are correct. 93 square miles – does that figure include the Sister Islands? Is that a new number we must get used to?	The figure in the document is incorrect and should be updated. According to the ESO Compendium of statistics, the total islands surface area is 102 sq. miles.	Update text to read: "Being an island community of 93 <u>102</u> sq. miles..."
	2-263		██████: With new technology it is possible to get more precise calculations, so yes I accept that number as the new size.	See above	See above
	2-264		We are hoping that when they start doing the Area Plans, they will do the zoning simultaneously.	Zoning for each parcel will be considered as part of the Area Plan preparation process, in consultation with land owners and the community	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-265	2.3 - APPROPRIATE AND EFFICIENT USE OF LAND	Going through the document you will find that what they are saying indirectly is that your density will increase.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.	None
	2-266		Growth has not been balanced. When we talk about growth something that has been obviously missing and I am particularly concerned about West Bay because it is the most densely populated district. When you look at it from an aerial view, there is not a lot of vacant land left here in WB. Much of what is left we are not going to have access to it. I think we have already accepted that, that's a fact. It's owned by the Darts, and he is not in the business of selling. In terms of going back to the usage of land, I believe what we failed to do, and we must ensure with whatever is left, we make adequate provision for the community that is here. Right now, I am looking to expand my business that would serve WB very well and I am not sure where I would put that business. It is not heavy industrial business. You know better than I – there is really no zoning for it. It's a tyre business. I have a store in Town, and of course a lot of my customers are people who come from West Bay too. Something as simple as businesses like that, we know historically around WB if someone wants a garage, they find a tree, set up a shop under a tree and before you know it, it falls into something else - there is no designated areas for it– it almost kind of late for WB for that but I think that is the balance and utilization that needs to be thought about.	Noted. The Area Plan process will enable members of the community to suggest appropriate zoning for their area. Appropriately located light industrial zones and neighborhood commercial zones would be encouraged. Section 3.5 of the Planning Statement indicates that the Authority shall ensure adequate long-term supply of industrial land to meet market demand and that this will be both within existing industrial areas as well as identifying areas suitable for locally-serving light industrial uses in outlying districts.	None
	2-267		The most Efficient use of land means putting as many buildings as possible on it. Example, instead of one apartment put four apartments. The density increases but that area becomes more populated so is it the most appropriate use of the land? There are some land uses that are just more suitable/appropriate in some locations, eg., hospitals and sewage treatment plants should not be close together whereas some educational facilities and residences should be close together.	Noted. Efficient use of land is about preventing low density sprawl and encouraging a mix of building types, rather than allowing single-storey properties in areas with high accessibility.	None
	2-268		Going through the document you will find that what it is saying is that your density will increase.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exists or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.	None
	2-269	2.4 - QUALITY OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	There is the preservation and conservation of existing natural areas but secondly what we fail to do is within Urban area is to create a healthy environment. Obviously, our natural vegetation, our native shrubs and species provide not only support by diversity, but they also provide clean air to help offset pollution and heat index of these buildings and all these types of things and in the U.K. their latest Planning Regulations for any development requires, I think at least 10% but it could be 30% of the footprint has to be dedicated to green. Not grass, not a Pickle Ball Court but a natural asset that is going to contribute back to biodiversity. That is something I don't think is adequately mentioned in this because it is trying to separate the two but it isn't talking about connecting both together because you can't say we are going to have a park over there and preserve that bit and then this becomes all concrete; because you have it all connected, so that would be good to incorporate under this section.	Noted, and thank you for the suggestions. Further policy considerations on natural resources and environmental preservation are set out in section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement document. Development and Planning Regulations set out site coverage requirements, which vary by zone. These could be amended in due course, and vary between different areas in the Cayman Islands, if supported by the community as part of the Area Plan process.	None
	2-270		Sustainablecayman.org Podcast. Island Ecosystem important – try to engage with young people. They have some very good ideas.	Noted	None
	2-271		The Development and Planning Act 2021 is primarily concerned with the Use of Land, Lands and Survey the registration of land. The CPA is mandated to regulate the use of land. So when they ask me who's responsibility it is to provide housing (Economic development), I am not sure if that should really fits into the Use of Land (how many houses you build per acre is a different story versus who's responsibility it is to build them and the cost of them). If you take a more comprehensive approach Planning where you can incorporate the social, environmental, economic aspects into your planning consideration, then yes, but just not based on a pure land use plan, I think that they sometimes going a little off track. It is a fundamental responsibility to provide housing for all income levels of people, I agree. Should that be part of this document? The prices, the cost of housing? One way you could bring the cost of housing down, is by increasing your density on a lot of land. So instead of having just one house on a quarter acre of land (100 x 100), you put 5 or 6. That would bring the cost of housing down because you now have more houses on one piece of land, and the only how you would be able to do that is to go up as you only have so much space horizontally.	Noted. These are various tools within planning policy and regulations that can impact the size of individual units and the number of units that can be provided on a parcel of land.	None
	2-272		My suggestion on that is that in terms of the Planning Fees that they impose, that they want Affordable Housing – they should perhaps adjust those fees to a certain threshold, say a house up to \$300,000 in value, but \$225 a square foot, so if it is under a 1000 Sq. ft. they just waive those fees and that will drop that down and perhaps also simplify the process where not changing the Planning Regulations all the time requiring different things and not requiring other things later on, so simplifying the process while at the same time maintaining quality and then focus on, of course making sure safety is there as well, but then for larger structures they can do whatever they want; if they want to ensure that they pour the concrete to 7000 psi, they can go to	Noted. Planning Fees are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-273		There is more than the cost of the building to consider – satisfaction, social and mental cost, quality of life.	Noted	None
	2-274		More density should make cost of each unit cheaper. However, referencing apartments on Linford Pierson Highway - \$400,000 is not affordable housing. People are purchasing them as second properties for rental. Government should do something about it.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses. The purchasing of second properties is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-275		Expats are purchasing and entering Airbnb.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-276		Winter birds – don’t think they would be so averse to some sort of infrastructure fee.	Infrastructure Fund fees are applied as part of construction projects, as outlined in the Development and Planning Regulations	None
	2-277		The quality of our Natural Environment, variety of natural features, forestry of land, mangroves, wetlands, coastline and the Eco-system accounts for partial monetary value and it is important that growth and development is balanced.	Noted. The Planning Statement document acknowledges the growth and development must be balanced with protection of the natural environment	None
	2-278		To date do you all think that growth and Development has been balanced? No!!	Noted. These are issues that the Planning Statement and PlanCayman as a whole are seeking to address	None
	2-279		The Housing is a bit skewed as well because for example, if we were back to a sustainable population, we wouldn’t have the issues we are having now with housing and perhaps we could have made sure that planning was done properly but the people that existed at the 55,000-population people. But with the extreme development we are doing, we are bringing in low-income wage people that can’t afford housing but like in Cayman Brac, building housing for them whereas now, NAU is having problems getting housing for people that already exist and are Caymanians. So that whole thing is skewed if we don’t control our population gap. So, this problem will just get worse, the more people we bring in, the more construction workers etc., on top of the existing problem we already have. So, we still need to address that population gap and development, maybe as well as a moratorium too, instead of just keep building and increasing the problem. We need to address the problems and stop increasing the building and higher population.	As noted above, the Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards.	None
	2-280		██████, you were talking about the cost per unit. I had a prominent person here in West Bay, our age group, say to me several years ago, why don’t you build some more buildings on this land, next to my house. I assured him that I like some open spaces because the cost you are talking about is economic, but when we factor in the cost of transportation, medical cost, the ego next to each other might generate because of problems of healthy communications, communicable diseases and all those type of things, and just the satisfaction of being able to live and look out and see some green and open space. So when we talk about cost, we have to be careful that we are not just talking about economic but social, health, mental cost and quality of life.	Noted. The Planning Statement document acknowledges the growth and development must be balanced with protection of the natural environment	None
	2-281		██████ :- Agree.	Noted	None
	2-282		I have a concern and I don’t know if this is the correct place to raise it but talking about the land situation; our young people, like ██████ said, we don’t have much land in West Bay but we have our children etc., here. There is a situation now where our West Bay people are having to go to Bodden Town and other places to purchase land and to live there away from their family because they can’t afford land here; it is too expensive. We have another situation with our youth coming out of school, they cannot afford to pay the rent, they cannot afford to buy land, they can’t build a home; and several of them are ending up in a homeless situation. I have taken in one before for temporary housing and I have another one in my house right now. Young people coming out, holding two jobs, but still can’t pay the rent; I have a big concern with land, and someone mentioned about the Planning Fees, even as just a general middle-class Caymanian or whatever, paying the Planning Fees are a lot. The Architecture Fees, they have gone out of the roof now. I don’t see how Caymanians can survive any longer in this environment, especially the younger Caymanians that presently don’t have anything.	Noted. These, among many others, are issues that the Planning Statement and PlanCayman as a whole are seeking to address	None
	2-283		For Caymanians who want to buy a plot of land at some point in the future, they will probably end up with a much smaller parcel of land than the traditional quarter of an acre, because I foresee Government reducing the lot sizes so that it becomes that much more affordable for everyone.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density and smaller lot sizes, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	2-284	2.5 - THE SUPPLY AND COST OF HOUSING	As we have got people in the room here who could probably answer. You have said that more density on a parcel of land makes the property cheaper. That is what we have been told but if you look at the Linford Pierson Highway where all the development along there was meant to be, supposedly, affordable housing, \$400,000 going up, I wouldn't say is affordable housing. From what I have read, what happens to those properties, they become 2nd or 3rd home purchases for people who are using them as rental income units. I think that is what is creating a huge part of the problem and I think that perhaps Government should start taxing second properties, or stamp duties or levies or whatever it is going to be, to curve that because I think most people who are doing that, are also not Caymanians. Caymanians can't even enter the market. So what you have now is foreign workers here buying properties and entering the Airbnb market and all of this and it is causing a huge problem. This is illegal.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exists or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses. The purchasing of second properties is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-285		There is an Infrastructure fee in place that somewhat addresses this – talking about the location not the building.	Section 37A of the Development and Planning Regulations provides detail on the Infrastructure Fund which is for the purpose of providing funds for development of roads, affordable housing and other infrastructure in the Islands.	None
	2-286		know other countries do it, like Canada for example. There are quite a few houses in Cayman where the snowbirds have, so they are vacant for six months or nine months of the year and they are only used by them three months of the year, when it is cooler. There are a lot of them in North Side especially. That is something, I don't like to use the word tax, but other countries have under-use of House fees (Cayman doesn't have it). How is that going to be addressed under housing situation because we are saying we need to go higher– which a lot of people do not want to go that high anyway, but this erodes our cultural, Caribbean, traditional house look. So why are we going higher when we got all these sprawling houses that are not used at all? We are not talking about investment like condos where tourist come into, we are just talking about houses that are not lived in and revenue could be generated but that's not mentioned in this at all.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-287		I think the tax thing we must be very careful with. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Call it a fee, if you prefer, not tax.• A levy.• Fee, tax, levy, because in all aspects of our lives we pay a lot of taxes. Cayman is a consumer economy: everything we wear and pretty much everything we eat is imported. So, we are paying taxes and I don't know that if you slide off and target, in this case, someone who has a house who's paid stamp duty, tax on it; how they use it, that might be a slippery slope.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-288		No, but the thing is, we are all agreeing/saying that we need to build a lot of these thirty story buildings to accommodate people (No, No) (10 stories), forget the number but what is said is that we need to go up rather than sprawl (particularly in WB you do), right so that's a conversation. So my point is, when we've got, let's just say 100 or 200 more of these sprawl houses that are not being used; in Canada for example, we have a home in Canada and we now have to pay tax on it because it is used, it's a rental. It shouldn't be included in that, but they have introduced a tax for that.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-289		A lot of countries avoid Canada because the price of everything is very high in Canada. The U.S, does have a tax on foreigners, you come in and you buy something we're going to tax you, when you sell it we're going to tax you 15% because they were having a lot of money coming in from Asia back in the 80s.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-290		Ok we're just talking about underused housing, so for all the houses that are here, that aren't being used, and all the space that is not being used by Caymanians, now we must go and buildup because we are lacking space. That's the whole idea for bringing up that conversation.	Noted, but the use and occupation period of homes is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-291		I think what [REDACTED] is saying, the people I have spoken to, who are these winter birds things – I don't think they would be averse to paying something, whether it's an infrastructure fee. I mean when they live here, they go out they buy cars they use but they would be doing that back home as well, right; but they would be used to paying for garbage collection, street cleaning, all those types of things, so I don't think they would be so averse to paying some sort of infrastructure fee.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-292		The report says that Tourism and Financial Service is basically what has driven Cayman’s economic success. They have contributed a lot to our revenues; but the Construction Industry has brought in a lot of service workers that we have not been able to provide any housing for. Now is it the Government’s responsibility to provide housing or is that the private sector’s responsibility? You can have a discussion as to how that can happen, but we know there is a housing crisis on the Island. How are we going to address that? Greater density (Statement: ████████ : Reduce construction). ████████ That might address the problem with the foreign workers but what about the young Caymanians who wants to buy a piece of property to build his or her own house? The costs are high because the Banks aren’t going to give you a break on interest rates, Government fees are set, and so are the realtors. However, Govt. has helped a little; if you apply for a house say under 1000 sq ft, then the building permit fee is only \$50. If you go over 1200 sq ft then the fee structure changes, so there are some instances where they are trying to protect the lower income person; not necessarily Caymanians but anyone who applies for a building permit can get that fee. It is not just for Caymanians or non-Caymanians.	Noted	None
	2-293		As on the point of construction. Construction isn’t an industry that exists by itself, not like a leading industry, it’s a lagging, kind of, you don’t build just for building sake, you build because of that economic need to build, there’s a demand to build, so you build for that, and then you bring in the workers for that reason but then after you build, they go home. They are not really going to stay around, they are going to move to the next project, so you are not really going to have to worry about these construction workers staying and going, I mean, theoretically you shouldn’t have to, they will probably go back home, maybe, but, it’s a trailing industry so we wouldn’t really have to worry about construction as a kind of leading industry; there has to be something that is driving the need for all of this construction. Then if you dig down a little bit under that surface, you say, what is that need? Why are they building so much? Then you say, why is the Government committed to building so much? Let me put this in English Language. We have an offshore sector for a long time and it’s nothing to do with Cayman, It’s outside of Cayman. So, we have had an offshore structure where people slap a name plate on the door and they would say, this is my company, XYZ and they defer income, and they keep everything offshore and a couple of Lawyers and Accountants keeps some keys down in Cayman; that’s died. All of that is going away, so you now must be in Cayman. In the U.K. they have something called dumb down status, so they are running off the millionaires and billionaires and the global nooses, depends on what happens in the U.S. elections, coming down on a lot of people who don’t want to pay a lot of taxes on shore, so they have to find themselves offshore. If we basically continue down that same path that we have been on, there is going to be a lot lesser of that same business, it’s not the same business anymore and so they have to bring people in and that is why the population is being pushed up by Dart building a new store, a new office block because the people are coming in and if you say, hey we don’t want you, then that becomes a problem for Government because they have a lot of obligations because we haven’t put up money. Historically, we haven’t put up money; we like taking turkeys on election day or fridges. We like that, we don’t like putting up money so now we have a problem that is of our own cause/fault, not really anyone else’s. We need to balance the budget.	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-294		That’s right and there is another way of looking at that too, for example, what came first, the chicken or the egg? Like you said, Construction in the past wasn’t the leading industry but it seems to be now. When we had a lesser population, we didn’t need as much construction but if there was a plan put in place from a certain time to do this anyway, regardless of the population and the plan to build the population up, then yes construction becomes a main industry because someone is going to plan there and say we are going to build this regardless of what anyone says.	Noted	None
	2-295		Its market driven. If there is a demand, people build. Very few people here are building; someone may build a speck house here or there, but people aren’t building hoping that people would come.	Noted	None
	2-296		We are talking about the big hotels not the little Cayman houses, for example, ████████ had a chart earlier that showed population growth at a certain time, which made no sense – it was not sustainable. That wasn’t there by accident.	Noted	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-297		We made reference a while back to Bermuda. We are about the same population as Bermuda, but we are also about four times the size. If we, and this is what we are talking about, Planning, perhaps there is a greater attraction to being in Cayman, yes there is no direct income tax. I was talking to a friend of mine who is a developer, and he told me, since COVID, eight billionaires have moved to Cayman that he knows. Why? Because they are running out of places that they can live and live a standard of life that they want to without paying 40 and in some countries 60% of their income goes to tax. Because we are consumer based, they are going to pay some taxes here, but it is based on usage, what they use. If they go to the grocery store the goods are no higher price for them than they are for us. So, it is a level system in so much as the construction being a main driver for people that come here and spills off into housing, I don't know that that represents a great number. We go into the supermarkets, we go into most stores, if you're in business, you need people. So, construction is a limited window that those people are here for. Some may stick around; some may meet somebody and get married but most of them will leave. It's all the other industries, 35000 work permits, it's all those other industries. You go to the supermarkets and our own local population is not enough to drive that either. We are not having as many children as we used to so who's going to be stocking the stores/supermarkets and cashing you out?	These issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	2-298		I think it comes back to the question that ██████ raised earlier, who are we building for? Why are we needing all these buildings, for example, we know that Dart who is one of the largest landowners/developers here is building a lot of stuff but is it that what we really need it or is it because it is in his interest to fatten his pocket, so to speak. Is it something that we really need all that construction? I don't think so. I don't believe so because he not only building housing, but he also doing a lot of businesses that he is renting or whatever, so I think Government needs to make some kind of ruling on something like that because, in a short time, the whole place is going to be built out. Where is the green space that we are supposed to be leaving? A certain percentage of his land should be declared green space and remain that way forever.	Noted. The Planning Statement document acknowledges that a land use plan is required to manage the development of land and ensure a balance between different activities	None
	2-299		The report says significant climate change is happening. Scientists predict more storms, their intensity, frequency, ocean acidification, all those things. Some people say they are happening and there are others who say they are not. We are not going to try and decide that tonight. Something is happening (██████ for sure), but what is causing it?	These issues are acknowledged in section 2.7 of the draft Planning Statement	None
	2-300		Air conditioning, asphalt, taking down our trees – we are at fault. We have to blame ourselves. The trend is more costly.	Noted	None
	2-301		What is causing it? We all love air conditioning. Go out there and feel the temperature coming out of the air conditioner units. We all love the asphalt; we all love to take down our trees which reduces the amount of rainfall. So, I mean we are generating cost/paying cost. We are all at fault for it so there is no excuse. However, we continue to do these things and we must blame ourselves for it. (██████); If we keep doing the things we do we should not expect a different result). The trend is always more costly. Whatever is happening, it is going to cost us more and more. It is a simple fact.	Noted	None
	2-302		Statement: ██████: Take the roads for example, if you don't reserve those road corridors today, tomorrow they are not going to get any cheaper. When ██████ and I were in ██████, we recommended to a particular Minister that they start this land banking so we could get funds for the Government to start purchasing a lot more of the beach land. That stretch of land north of the Seven Mile Beach Public Beach, where the Kimpton is now down to Holean(?) Corner, the land was narrow between the road and the sea. We recommended that CIG buy the parcels. The reply was that it was too expensive. Can we buy it today. So yes, a lot of people are saying that climate change is here, the impacts will be greater and there are those naysayers that are saying it is not climate change that is causing this, but our climate isn't what it used to be, and something is affecting it. How we respond to those impacts is a major challenge and without some form of national plan, we have Climate Resilience, apparently it is now into a Ministry's name, so apparently, they are taking some notice. Let's hope that something is done because something needs to be done, sooner than later.	Noted. Climate resilience measures are incorporated into the Planning Statement document, including Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (section 4.2), Sensitive Coastline Overlay (section 4.6), Infrastructure (section 5.5), Design (section 5.6) and Natural Resources and Coastline (section 5.7). Also, the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (section 4.5) seeks to reflect land reserved for future road corridors.	None
	2-303		Each of us on an individual basis can drive less, that will help; and there are other measures that can be taken.	The Planning Statement supports public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the mixing of uses to create walkable centres, all of which would encourage fewer journeys by car	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-304	2.7 - RESPONDING TO CLIMATE CHANGE	Just a quick thing, we have a situation where addressing these things can sometimes disadvantage the existing situation for people in their homes. So for instance, if you have a home that is not built to code, like you don't have a standing seam roof, you're not going to be putting solar panels on there. If your home is sub-par and you are trying to reduce your cost, it is almost impossible to reduce your cost because they are going to say, you need to upgrade your home in order to take these efficiencies. So you know there is frensies at the moment like, there are advantages you can make but our building code actually is working against us. So, for instance, I am sure most new builds now probably like you to have air conditioning and insulation and all that type of thing. I have just installed one of those wall units that is connected directly to a solar panel, that doesn't require all of that other cost, to have central AC, to be connected to CUC and all of that; but I am lucky because I have standing seam roof and my home offered me a way to do that; and that is something that we need to give access more to people but I don't know how we are going to do it if we're raising the bar.	Building codes exist to ensure that future development is safe and resilient. The Government's National Energy Policy Unit provides advice and energy saving guides for all properties.	None
	2-305		Raising the bar, we have so many things that are on our books, in so much as Laws and Regulations that really need revision. In the old days we had certain items that were duty free and still is and those were flour, milk, screens for windows and stuff like that. So, the same thing could be done with some of the things that could help people. That help could be across the board, Caymanian or non-Caymanian, whoever is building, because new construction they are requiring impact windows. I am not against that but what happens to our windows before? We got along fine without impact windows, but impact windows are probably three times the cost. Air conditioning is also very expensive.	Building Control provide alternatives for housing projects to include either impact windows or storm shutters	None
	2-306		Yes, impact windows are required, but not mandatory; you have a choice. You can put a less expensive window, but you need to have some protective covering for it, like shutters, so whether it is ready made shutters or plywood. If you are not going to put in something like shutters, then yes, you must put in the impact windows. However, when it comes to doing the CO, you must have these shutters in place onsite.	Noted	None
	2-307		So, there are ways to reduce that, they could do something energy efficient air conditioning. That could be duty free or at a reduced duty, we talk about other materials like insulation – insulation is extremely expensive. Why? Because largely it's bulky, and when you ship goods, it just takes a lot of space. Just to give you some idea of what has happened in that industry – shipping, that is so critical to us, because again, just about everything we consume daily has to be imported. In April I imported a container of loaded goods for \$7,500. Anybody want to guess what it is today. \$15,500. It's gone up \$8,000 in three months. How do you continue to absorb those costs, 22% on your goods. I do all the things that I need to do but I am just simply saying there are things that can be done to lower the cost to consumers, greater efficiencies in many items and we here must lead in terms of creating a sustainable Cayman. That is not something that poor people do here. However, we are not going to solve it all tonight.	The Government's National Energy Policy Unit provides advice and energy saving guides for all properties.	None
	2-308		The document in my view has a very economic slant to it I have some mixed feelings about it.	The Planning Statement document acknowledges the growth and development must be balanced with protection of the natural environment	None
	2-309		Personally, I would like to see some sort of Carbon Crediting System where you decide if you had land, I will give a bit of background, I am on a Board in New Hampshire Preservation Trust and the State of New Hampshire just put up 34% of public lands, so they put up a substantial piece of estate for public purposes and most of the U.S. has put in upwards of 30+% of land which is a global standard, you need upwards of 30% of land for nature, 70% you can do whatever you want with it. So, between 30 and 50% is... California is 50%. A lot of people say it is a beautiful State. It is a beautiful State because they have 50% of their land put up where people can go out, enjoy, look at it, and say, wow, this is nature. If you don't put up a substantial portion..., but how New Hampshire and California got to that wasn't the state or the Government putting up all of this, it was private people. So the Trust that I sit on, has put up tens of thousands of acres of land and then the Federal Government and other land owners, put up thousands of acres on top of that and then the Government would say oh, we'll put up a certain amount of acres on top of it, so it is usually private donations that fund, like the National Trust we have here but you need private donations to create these large spaces. So, a system of financially compensating. How it is done there is tax. You give some land; they take away the tax and you keep the prime stuff/land for yourself, and you give away a lot of the woodland for the bears and the birds and everything else and you're not really going to use it for your residence. So just to say if people had land and there was a compensation system where... I am not going to push this down, for just keeping some more grass on it, I'm going to keep it and I am going to be compensated for it because it is good for Cayman, and it makes the place beautiful and it's good for the environment. That would be my suggestion.	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. The National Trust for the Cayman Islands' Land Reserve Fund carries out this role, to some degree	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-310		There are ways and means of doing that. One way of doing that is Transfer of Development rights. Let's say for example, you have ten acres of land and under the current legislation and you are allowed twenty apartments, but nine of those acres is a critical habitat and should be preserved in its natural state. You can preserve those nine acres and we make you build your twenty apartments on the one acre. If you go to different parts of the world suddenly you may see a taller building than those that are surrounding it, that is probably one of those instances where they have transferred/given up some rights and put them on one smaller piece of land. That is one way of achieving a lot more open space but again, you would have to sacrifice something to be able to do that.	Noted. In some instances, and on a case-by-case basis, the proposed Natural Resource Preservation Overlay section 4.2 of the Planning Statement document) could lead to these kinds of arrangements, by protecting certain national resources from development while not outright removing development rights	None
	2-311	2.8 - ENHANCING PLACE QUALITY	We are into enhancing the place quality. We need to have these great communities to have these attractive and comfortable places where you can meet, interact, relax and enjoy ourselves; enjoy our streets and public spaces. Several countries have more vibrant communities whereby people interact; not get up in the morning go to work, come back home and stay inside; they make the streets a lot more livable. George Town is a good example of what not to do. At 5 o'clock pm, it's dead. (██████ and it never used to be like that). No. Like I said, we have grown and developed around an automobile. The U.S. is basically the same way in most instances. Now they have realized, and they are talking about Urban sprawl, again in the U.S. they are starting to build more compact communities. As I said, you will see some of these taller buildings just spring up out of nowhere, and some of those are those that are doing those Transferable Development Rights.	Noted	None
	2-312		The problem I have with this statement in this paragraph here is when it is talking about characteristics. They are talking about the built environment here, right. They are talking about Camana Bay. But I think if people are talking about the characteristics of the Cayman Islands, if you ask Caymanians, they would be talking more about Pageant Beach, hanging out on their veranda, having their kids play in the yard or on the beach in front of them, Barbecue, that type of thing. So, I think this is quite a dangerous paragraph, this one, enhancing place quality; because it doesn't reflect Cayman Islands at all, it doesn't reflect our character of Caribbean Islands.	Section 2.8 is written in general terms about places where people can 'meet, interact, relax and enjoy themselves'. This does not exclude any particular character or community type.	None
	2-313		If you look at older Caymanian houses, the vast majority had porches (██████ they were built sustainably – they didn't need the air conditioner) and neighbours would sit in the evenings and talk to each other. Presently, when neighbours return home in the evenings they generally stay inside until they leave for work the next morning. There is no more social interaction.	Noted	None
	2-314		Characteristics – talking about the built environment - talking about Camana Bay – Ask Caymanians? It does not reflect our Caymanian Culture.	Noted. Section 2.8 does not refer to Camana Bay	None
	2-315		Camana Bay – Live, work and play. Still have this. Go East Campaign. West Bay going to Bodden Town. Aerial map – population containment – foreigners are here to serve us. We don't have enough people (Caymanians) to serve us. Bahamas want what we got. Late for West Bay.	Noted	None
	2-316	2.9 - IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION	Look at Cayman Brac. Cayman Brac has more Bus Stops than Grand Cayman as it relates to the district level. Along Seven Mile Beach we have several bus stops and shelters done by Rotary – fund raising, and I applaud them for doing it. But have you seen any Government installed bus stops? Melony: Just signs that say bus stop. (██████ in the districts?	The Planning Statement acknowledges that improvements to public transport are needed and supported	None
	2-317		At one point, a lot of them appeared along South Sound Road; in front of people houses.	Noted	None
	2-318		If you are taking a bus from here to North Side, I just don't understand how that even works. The diesel that you burn to just carry two people (the buses even stop on the round-about – yes). Yes, the drivers stop to drop off/pickup passengers wherever they are on the road or where they ask to be dropped off.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-319		Even more reason why they should be using designated stops. In the UK, in London at least, they have the bus stop sign right at the edge of the road but then you have a little parking area for the bus to stop right there. You don't necessarily need a big bus shelter, a turn off for it to work.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-320		I think the bus shelter would be necessary if it is raining or if it is really hot; because we have a lot of hot sun here which you might not have in the U.K.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-321		A bus stop shelter is very necessary. Sometimes it might be difficult to install some now at every stop, but do they have to have a bit more flexibility. I am not advocating to have a bus shelter at every bus stop; but where feasible, there should be a shelter.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-322		The thing is as you said, they are not provided by Government, they are provided by Rotary and sponsored by private companies.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-323		Has the actual transportation system improved in the last ten years? (All: No.) On the West Bay to George Town route the buses run fairly frequent – yes, one is right behind the other.	Noted. Existing bus operations are outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	2-324		Sustainablecayman.org works with an ambassador group and they have launched their own Podcast called Island Ecos and their latest podcast is discussing transportation and I think it's really important that we try to engage with the young people/students, who are actually all away at University, experiencing public transport more than we do because they got some really cool ideas.	Noted	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-325		We can drive less.	The Planning Statement supports public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the mixing of uses to create walkable centres, all of which would encourage fewer journeys by car	None
	2-326		There must be a people centred Public Transport system – ease of access, affordability, convenient.	Agreed. The Planning Statement supports an enhanced public transport system that is safe, efficient and appealing and provides a viable alternative to private vehicles	None
	2-327	2.10 - MEETING DEMANDS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE	if your home is sub-par, you need to upgrade home to take these efficiencies. Our building code is working against us. I wanted to install a unit that is solar, but I could not do it because I have a standing seam roof. Some of the things could be done for persons: reduce fees such as is done for milk etc.	Building codes exist to ensure that future development is safe and resilient. The Government's National Energy Policy Unit provides advice and energy saving guides for all properties.	None
WR22	2-328		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR23	2-329		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR24	2-330	2.1 Introduction	Really well written! Others may differ in opinion. No further observations.		
	2-331	2.2 Adapting to a growing population	Really well written! Just a minor tweak recommended. The 1st sentence of paragraph 3 covers population impacts (i.e. challenges). Accordingly, the 2nd paragraph should be about identifying opportunities (means) to address such impacts. - Recommendation - Amend 2nd sentence of paragraph 3 to end ‘...is one of the key opportunities for this plan.’	Agreed, this amendment can be incorporated.	Amend section 2.2 to replace word 'challenges' with 'opportunities'.
	2-332	2.3 Efficient use of land	Observations Excellentlly written! Small tweaks recommended (see below). The paragraph summarises well at a high level appropriate and efficient use of land. That being said, it could be rephrased in a more positive light and a bit less wordy. Having ‘amenity’ and ‘infrastructure’ are only 2 terms in what could be an exhaustive list. Best to keep it general and brief, as the aim of the paragraph could be further fleshed out in supporting documents (e.g. the Act and Regulations). Also, the ‘93 square miles’ may be a remnant from when the Plan did not include the Sister Islands. The total combined size of the 3 Islands should be about 102 square miles (subject to correction).	Noted	
	2-333		Amend the 1st sentence in the paragraph to delete ‘93’ and replace it with the correct size for the combined 3 Islands. Is it 102 square miles?	Noted, this change will be reflected in the document.	Replace 93 with 102
	2-334		Amend the last sentence in the paragraph to read ‘Decisions should ensure that how land is developed and used positively impact an area.’	Acknowledged	Amend last sentence in section 2.3 to state, " Decisions made should ensure that how land is developed and used positively impact an area."
	2-335	2.4 Quality of the natural environment	Really well written! Others may differ in opinion.	Noted	
	2-336	2.5 The supply and cost of housing	Really well written! The general / high level paragraph provides room for a variety of means to tackle housing challenges.	Noted	
	2-337		PLACEHOLDER for related documents in due course (the Act and Regulations). To boost effectiveness of identifying and implementing solutions, will suggest including reference to crucial approaches such as market factors [e.g. inclusionary zoning incentivizing developers that reduces government’s affordable housing cost burden, while mitigating undesirable social stratification, as well as supporting synergy with other key components, such as transportation and health (e.g. ensuring that higher residential zones are within walking distance from main transportation corridors to stimulate public transportation and realise better public health).	Acknowledged. The existing text is considered suitable and any future Government Affordable Housing initiatives can be incorporated in Area Plans / Regulations as appropriate.	
	2-338	2.6 Maintaining a successful economy	REALLY WELL-THOUGHT-OUT HIGH-LEVEL PARAGRAPH capturing the essence of challenges and what’s needed to mitigate such issues. Minor tweak recommended (amendment of the last sentence in the paragraph) to engender more commitment. -Recommendation: end the last sentence with ‘...a modern, inclusive and safe community shall be supported.’	Acknowledged	Amend last sentence in section 2.8 to state, "...standards that are expected in a modern, inclusive and safe community should shall be encouraged supported".
	2-339	2.7 Responding to climate change through 2.8 Enhancing place quality	EXCELLENT! No further observations	Noted	
	2-340		Really well written! No further observations.	Noted	
	2-341		Recommend tweaking the paragraph to also recognise diminished economic productivity (time spent in traffic), challenges to the public purse (transportation infrastructure and health and the opportunity for synergy with other subjects to mitigate transportation challenges (e.g. higher residential density zones near major road corridors to enable (in due course) a sustainable market for public transportation, among other benefits (e.g. the health and social benefits of pedestrianism).		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-342	2.9 Improving Transportation	Amend the 2nd sentence in the paragraph as follows (see above observations / rationale for the recommended amendments). 'This dependence on private vehicles contributes to congestion, diminished economic productivity (time spent in traffic), decreases air quality negatively impacts health, and additional cost to the public purse for transportation infrastructure and public health.'	Noted, however it is considered that productivity is unaffected and traffic instead results in persons spending less time at home.	
	2-343		Amend last sentence of the paragraph as follows - 'If properly planned and supported, these forms of transport can be enjoyable, non-polluting, efficient and safe, while reducing cost to the public purse for transportation infrastructure and health.'	Noted, although in absence of data to confirm, considered that current wording is sufficient.	
	2-344	2.10 Meeting demands for infrastructure	The paragraph captures well at a high level the benefits of meeting infrastructure demands, including quality of life and economic growth / development. Since there is no explicit reference to the environment, as written, some stakeholders may see this as "at the peril of the environment." However, the paragraph could easily mitigate this potential concern through a minor amendment (insert).	Noted	
	2-345		Amend the 2nd sentence as follows - 'Safe and appealing alternatives are required, such as public transportation, walking and cycling, while respectful of the environment.'	Existing wording acknowledges that public transportation, walking and cycling can be non-polluting and therefore is more respectful of the environment. No change needed.	
WR25	2-346		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR26	2-347		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR27	2-348		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	2-349		(pg.7) Section 2 The Challenges and Opportunities we face. The paragraphs in this chapter are inconsistent in format. Some acknowledge challenges only, while others make a recommendation based on the current/expected challenges. E.g. Section 2.6 highlights the need for a diverse economy and concludes with a statement outlining the need to encourage/support certain emerging industries. Recommend these sections be revised to ensure each section concludes with a recommendation that outlines a preferred focus for responding to the challenges outlined.	This section is contextual for the remainder of the document and the introduction (3rd paragraph) states 'this section sets out some of the key challenges we need to address in our planning policies'. Solutions to these challenges are sometimes very complex and cannot be summarised succinctly in this section, but instead relate to the policies set out in the rest of the document.	None
	2-350	2.3	Pg.7 Section 2.3 Appropriate and Efficient Use of Land - 93 square miles is quoted. The total land area of the Cayman Islands is 102 square miles. Recommend changing this to the correct number.	The figure in the document is incorrect and should be updated. According to the ESO Compendium of statistics, the total islands surface area is 102 sq. miles.	Update text to read: "Being an island community of 93 <u>102</u> sq. miles..."
	2-351	2.4	2.4 Quality of the Natural Environment - The first paragraph's first sentence does not recognize the importance of our freshwater wetlands, which are distinct from mangroves, and the rapid pace at which we are losing these to development. Recommend it is changed to "The Cayman Islands boasts a variety of natural ecosystems such as dry forests, shrublands, mangroves and freshwater wetlands, and scenic coastlines which..."	Noted, this suggested change can be incorporated	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove <u>s and freshwater</u> wetlands , <u>caves, sinkholes</u> and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society <u> culture and biodiversity.</u> "
	2-352		The first paragraph's second sentence is recommended to be changed to "The Cayman Islands Government ecosystem accounts, ... represent provide a partial monetary value of the services provided by these natural ecosystems <u>features</u> ..."	Noted, this suggested change can be incorporated	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands Government ecosystem accounts, updated on an annual basis, <u>provide represent</u> a partial monetary value of these natural <u>environmental ecosystem</u> features to national gross domestic product, fisheries, agriculture, carbon sequestration, coastal protection, tourism and amenity value."
	2-353		"Natural features" include caves and sinkholes which are habitat for bats and other species but not recognized in this section. Caves, especially in Cayman Brac, are also historically linked to hurricane sheltering and therefore have cultural significance. Recommend enhancing this section to include caves and sinkholes and acknowledge the habitat and cultural/heritage significance.	Noted, reference to caves and sinkholes can be included. A general reference to the cultural value of all natural features can also be included.	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove <u>s and freshwater</u> wetlands , <u>caves, sinkholes</u> and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society <u> culture and biodiversity.</u> "
	2-354		Second paragraph second sentence: it should be less about striking "A careful balance" - the decision tools which are not properly utilised in the Cayman Islands (i.e. EIAs, Cost-Benefit Analyses (CBA), Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC), etc.) - and more about properly valuing the services of these natural areas such that they are encouraged (incentivized) to be retained and included in the valuation price of real estate by the industry and Government (LSD). Recommend changing this sentence to read " A careful balance must be struck between what is a valuable natural feature and desirable development. The CPA when determining this balance should utilise all the tools available, such as EIAs, CBAs and LACs".	Noted, however all tools available to the Authority under D&P Act are utilised. PlanCayman aims to support that by providing additional evidence / information and an updated set of policies	None
	2-355		Second paragraph last sentence: Again, freshwater wetlands are among "Areas of particular concern" because of the rate at which they are disappearing from the landscape. They are habitat for critically endangered native and migratory species, former are protected under domestic legislation, and the latter under regional conventions to which the Cayman Islands is a signatory. Recommend changing the sentence to add Freshwater Wetlands	Noted, this suggested change can be incorporated	Amend s.2.4, as follows: "Areas of particular concern include virgin forests, beaches and the mangrove <u>and freshwater</u> wetlands which can also provide storm and hurricane protection."
	2-356		Recommend an acknowledgment of the intrinsic value of the natural environment to Caymanian cultural identity is included in this section, concluded with a recommendation for the CPA.	Noted. This can be incorporated in the first sentence.	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove <u>s and freshwater</u> wetlands , <u>caves, sinkholes</u> and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society <u> culture and biodiversity.</u> "

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	2-357		No recognition of the intrinsic value of natural heritage to Caymanian cultural identity. Recommend adding the following “Natural heritage forms the cornerstone of Caymanian cultural identity, reflecting deep-rooted connections to the islands’ land and sea. As the increasing pressure on these natural elements continues a balance must be struck between development growth and its protection”.	Noted, however a reference to the benefits to Cayman culture has been suggested for the 1st sentence (see above)	None
	2-358	2.5	2.5 The Supply and Cost of Housing – Recommend revising the first sentence to: “Providing safe places for people to live comfortably, at all income levels, is a fundamental responsibility...”	Noted, these amendments can be incorporated	Amend s.2.5 as follows: "Providing <u>safe</u> places for people to live <u>comfortably</u> , at all income levels, is a fundamental responsibility and the challenge has become significantly greater as the population grows."
	2-359		It is good that mixed-use development and sustainable communities are encouraged, however, redevelopment of brownfields should be a priority. Utilising Brownfield sites will reduce the cost of housing as critical infrastructure (roads, water, electricity) already exists. This would help to achieve both the strategic objectives to “secure biological biodiversity and ensure sustainable use of natural resources” and “provision of sustainable infrastructure” by preserving greenfields (e.g. virgin forests etc. mentioned in Section 2.4). Recommend adding language to this section to recommend and prioritize the building of homes (including affordable homes) on existing brownfield sites.	Noted, and the preferred use of brownfield sites is recognised. The Planning Statement includes references to utilising brownfield sites for industrial and commercial uses. It is not recommended to reference this approach in this section (despite the acknowledged benefits) since the identified challenge of 'supply and cost of housing' would not be met by prioritising certain sites over others. However, there is an opportunity within Area Plan preparation is to increase density in appropriate areas (those served by road and other infrastructure) which in many cases will be brownfield sites.	None
	2-360	2.6	2.6 MAINTAINING A SUCCESSFUL ECONOMY – It time the real estate and development/construction sectors are recognized as pillars of the economy, even during border closures/tourism shutdowns in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Detailed statistics were collected in these sectors, perhaps better than what is attributed to tourism’s contribution to GDP. The CPA and CIG more broadly need to be honest with the people of this country on this point. Furthermore, if it is not addressed here, then why is there a need to strike a careful balance between what (and who decides) is a valuable natural feature and desirable development noted in 2.4? Quality tourism and a robust financial services sector can be accomplished through other policies that are not pinned to physical development but (re)branding, legislation, etc. Encouragement of “the green economy” is a good but the policies in this Planning Statement do not reflect this, e.g. no requirement for solar-ready new builds or compliance with energy efficiency codes; no encouragement of retrofitting older building stock; no zone or overlay for utility-scale solar or wind installations; no Nature Tourism Zone, etc. Recommend this document add these aspects to truly support the development of “the Green Economy”	Noted. The first sentence of this section indicates that tourism and financial service industries have driven the Cayman economy for many years. Real Estate / Development / Construction, while no doubt a major part of the economy, exists to support Tourism and Financial Services and is not an economy in and of itself. The construction relates to hotels, homes for staff, office developments etc . The Planning Statement does not prevent any of the green economy measures / aspects listed.	
	2-361	2.7	2.7 Responding to Climate Change – Recommend incorporating a link to the CCRA. Conclude this section with a recommendation for the CPA. Also recommended to highlight that all existing and future developments (e.g., homes, properties, infrastructure) must be considered in light of the climate risks we are facing. Adaptation measures must be used to lower vulnerability to climate risks. Energy matters must also be included (e.g., energy efficiency, renewables, etc.)	The draft Planning Statement has a reference to the CCRA. The suggestion regarding a recommendation for CPA is noted, however other sections in S.2 of the draft Planning Statement do not have a recommendation for CPA. A broad statement to this effect can be included however.	Insert Appendix with list of approved National Strategies and referenced documents. Amend s.2.7, as follows: "The ongoing and predicted impacts of climate change have the potential to affect every individual, organisation and sector in the Cayman Islands, including but not limited to: human health and wellbeing, the natural environment, food security and water supply, economic prosperity, human settlements and infrastructure, and national security. <u>Future developments should therefore adopt appropriate climate change adaptation measures.</u> "
	2-362		This section confuses climatic changes with resulting impacts. Recommend the following rewrite of the first paragraph: “A number of significant climate change changes impacts are affecting the Cayman Islands, including changes in storms, cyclones, winds, waves and storm surges; changes in ocean circulation; changes in rainfall patterns and freshwater input; ocean acidification; changes in salinity; accelerated sea-level rise; and increasing sea and air temperatures (including humidity); and decreasing dissolved oxygen of seawater. These create a host of impacts, including but not limited to heatwaves, droughts and floods; increased coastal erosion; reduced agricultural productivity; and increased diseases which jeopardise lives, livelihoods and property. These impacts and the resulting risks to the Cayman Islands economy, society, biodiversity and habitats are detailed in the Cayman Islands Climate Change Risk Assessment which is updated every five years.”	Noted, these amendments can be incorporated	Amend s.2.7, as follows: "A number of significant <u>changes in</u> climate change-impacts are affecting the Cayman Islands, including changes in storms, cyclones, winds, waves and storm surges; changes in ocean circulation; <u>changes in rainfall patterns and changes in</u> freshwater input; ocean acidification; changes in salinity; <u>accelerated</u> sea-level rise; increasing air and sea temperature <u>s</u> (including humidity); increasing-coastal-erosion ; and decreasing dissolved oxygen of seawater. <u>These create a host of impacts, including but not limited to heatwaves, droughts and floods; increased coastal erosion; reduced agricultural productivity; and increased diseases which jeopardise lives, livelihoods and property.</u> These impacts and the resulting risks to the Cayman Islands economy, society, biodiversity and habitats are detailed in the Cayman Islands Climate Change Risk Assessment which is updated every five years."

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	2-363		Second paragraph should read: "... the natural environment, food and energy security, water supply, ..."	Noted, these amendments can be incorporated	Amend s.2.7, as follows: "The ongoing and predicted impacts of climate change have the potential to affect every individual, organisation and sector in the Cayman Islands, including but not limited to: human health and wellbeing, the natural environment, food <u>and energy</u> security, and water supply, economic prosperity, human settlements and infrastructure, and national security. "
	2-364	2.8	Section 2.8 ENHANCING PLACE QUALITY Recommend a separate section is dedicated to cultural and heritage assets; otherwise modify this section to recognise these and their value in creating a sense of place. Similar to acknowledging the worth of working with the natural environment noted in Section 2.4, these features or assets should be encouraged (incentivized) to remain in place wherever they occur, and sympathetically modernized as part of new developments. This is done very successfully in other jurisdictions, rather than demolition or relocation, which should be last resorts.	The Heritage Preservation Overlay, and Design sections of the draft Planning Statement concerns these issues. A reference can be included here though.	Amend s.2.8, as follows: "Great communities have attractive and comfortable places where people can meet, interact, relax and enjoy themselves. The Cayman Islands have a number of places with these characteristics but opportunities to improve our streets and public spaces to the standards that are expected in a modern, inclusive and safe community <u>and, where possible, incorporate cultural and heritage assets</u> should be encouraged. "
	2-365	2_10	Section 2.10 MEETING DEMANDS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE Recommend correcting "Cayman's" to "Cayman"	Agreed.	Amend s.2.10 as follows: "Physical infrastructure is the backbone of a developed country's economy and its quality of life standards and is essential to economic growth and development. The rapid population growth in the Cayman Is Islands has placed considerable pressure on existing infrastructure facilities and so there is a need for a sustainable infrastructure system that meets these demands in a cost effective manner to safely and efficiently serve the community in the long term. "
	2-366		As the other sections provide some solutions, this section could recognise the importance of the natural environment, especially the stormwater management services of freshwater wetlands, coastal protection of reefs, seagrasses and mangroves, or "green infrastructure" as part of this "cost effective" approach to infrastructure system delivery. Recommend rewriting this section to recognize the importance of the environmental service of natural ecosystems.	The term 'sustainable' is included in this section, in terms of economic, social and environmental sustainability. This is considered sufficient for this high-level section.	None
WR29	2-367		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR30	2-368		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR31	2-369		1. Sustainable Development Requires Managing Population Growth Section 1 of the Statement provides the general vision and the six strategic objectives to promote sustainable development. Section 2 reviews the challenges and opportunities we face. Section 2.2 states that one of the key challenges of the Plan is adapting to a growing population. Figure 2.1 provides the historical population growth. The Statement provides no projections, targets or policies for future population growth. The Water Authority agrees that population growth is a key challenge. We are of the view that the six strategic objectives to promote sustainable development may not be achieved in the absence of a comprehensive strategy to manage population growth. Without a comprehensive strategy to manage population growth the Water Authority will also be challenged to plan the continued development of its water and wastewater infrastructure. This is not only a challenge for the Water Authority but also impacts other entities involved in providing and developing infrastructure in the Cayman Islands.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	2-370		Section 2.7 of the Statement addresses the responses to climate change, but does not provide specific details. In the Water Authority's view such responses may be addressed in section 5 where other policy considerations are reviewed. In order to prepare future development for climate change specific policies for climate resiliency can be identified, such as minimum elevations for built development and roads, coastal set backs and energy efficiency.	Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement states, "climate resilience - incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies." These mechanisms and strategies are to be created by other governmental agencies / infrastructure providers but the Development Plan is expressing commitment to incorporate such policies when brought forward. Incorporated throughout Section 5, many of the policy considerations indirectly speaks to resiliency (Section 5.6.7) and environmentally friendly practices (Sections 5.4.2, 5.4.7, 5.4.9, 5.5, and 5.7). Additionally, setbacks and building heights will be considered at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process. Energy efficiency, is addressed through the adoption of updated building codes whilst minimum road elevation is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
WR32	2-371		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR33	2-372		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	3-001		What developer wrote these?	The Draft Planning Statement has been prepared by the Central Planning Authority, assisted by a Project Team formed by representatives of Ministry PAHITD, Ministry SCR and Department of Planning.	
	3-002		Ag Zones - take out housing, this is what has killed off so much Ag land already in Cayman. Mixed-Use (Neighborhood Commercial, or Residential/Commercial) Zone - Badly Needed! New Urbanism! Sustainable Development! Transportation Cost/Pollution/etc. Reduction! - This should replace most residential and commercial zones across the country to encourage better development (with appropriate safeguards, e.g., Town & Country Act / Public Health Act noise & other pollution ordinances) - At least MDR & HDR should ALL be Mixed-Use as their primary use. - And parks, community buildings, etc., SHALL be permitted. - What you want is density (height) restrictions zones within the 'Residential Community Development Zone'. ER/SFR/LDR Zone - leave/combine all as Low Density Residential; no need to encourage Estates (socially). If people want a bigger yard that is their choice, not the Governments. This is where you can leave commercial development, etc., as 'optional'. And limit building heights to two storeys maximum.	<p>The proposed agricultural zone allows for single family residences on larger lots, to support flexibility. The lots sizes will be determined within each Area Plan to respond to the needs of those places.</p> <p>The Planning Statement supports the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential areas. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.</p>	
	3-003		Commercial - What is a Marine Commercial Zone? Inadequately defined. Needs to be clearer. - General Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial Zones should be the same, except for height/density difference. GC max 5 storeys, NC max 3 storeys. (10 storey current allowances needs to be pulled rescinded as bad decision making a bad situation worse.) If Developer Demands and Political Interference require max 10 storey buildings for their own pecuniary antisocial interests then create a new 'High Density Commercial' zone to encompass the 'town centers' and 'tourist strip' with a maximum of 10 storeys. Jus not on the beach side of the roads, please, by all that Caymanians hold dear, not on the beach side of the road. - And nothing, either side of West Bay road or bypass, North of the public beach higher than 5 storeys.	<p>Marine Commercial already exists and is defined under Section 13 of the Development and Planning Regulations (2022 Rev). A brief definition is also highlighted in Section 3.4 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Height restrictions for all zones will be determined as part of each Area Plan.</p> <p>Noted regarding specific issues / recommendations which can be considered further in subsequent stages of the Plan Review.</p>	
	3-004		No Community Zones. The exempld developments all need to be integrated into (or allowed in) the other Zones. Otherwise you will be responsible for forcing continued unsustainable development practices upon the Cayman Islands requiring mass transit between antiquated zonal concepts.	Noted. Section 3.3 (Residential Zones) notes that community facilities may be permitted in Residential areas. The purpose of creating specific Community Zones is to provide landowners, neighbouring residents and infrastructure providers with more certainty about where such uses may be located.	
	3-005		Hotel Zone - "Development in HT zones will be carefully regulated to ensure that new buildings are guided by the needs of the industry" - NONONONONONONONO - HT zones will be carefully regulated to ensure that new buildings are guided by the needs of the COMMUNITY! - there, fixed it for you.	Noted. Section 3.7 (4) states that the Authority will prevent the over development of sites and will ensure that the scale and density of Tourism development is compatible with and sensitive to the physical characteristics of a site. Also, the location and scale of hotel zones will be determined in consultation with the community at Area Plan stage.	
	3-006		NT & RR Zones combined into one; really just NT (drop RR). - This is why most residential needs to be Mixed Use so that we can combine small lodges, and owner-rented 'villas', and long-term-rental housing, and owner-occupied housing, and small condos along the same coasts around all three islands. All of those uses are in keeping with each other, provided the density is kept low enough and the implementation aesthetic enough (including noise & light pollutions, sufficient parking, etc.) - While keeping the inherently unsustainable 'overtourism zone' to a minimum.	Noted, and acknowledge that the Tourism Zones have some commonalities. However, each Area Plan will have an opportunity to better define how each zone will be applied in that place (i.e. appropriate building heights etc). Also, having RR zone separate to residential zones provides greater certainty for landowners and residents.	
	3-007		POS/COS -Sensible re-division of zones. Now require much more OS for every development bigger than a duplex.	<p>Section 5.9 states that major developments (including multi-family residential and large commercial projects) to provide open space or active/passive recreation facilities.</p> <p>Area Plans provide an opportunity to determine open space deficiencies and the most appropriate response to that.</p>	
	3-008		CMB - Needs to be Coastal Buffer, regardless of mangroves (think South Sound boardwalk) and made much wider (or replace with proper setbacks).	Noted. The draft Planning Statement in Section 4.6 introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay and a review of coastal setbacks.	
FF2	3-009		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF3	3-010		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF4	3-011		Mixing of zoning is important, development models from all around the work are moving away from large sprawling zones for residential areas separated from commercial etc. The example of PAD private developments show the improvement to communities for mixed use areas. The GT revitalisation project would benefit hugely from integration of more mixed use solutions.	The Planning Statement supports the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.	
	3-012		There is no mapping of zones provided at all, this seems to be a glaring omission of the document.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF5	3-013		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	3-014			No Objection	
FF7	3-015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	3-016			No Objection	
FF9	3-017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF10	3-018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF11	3-019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	3-020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	3-021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	3-022		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF15	3-023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	3-024		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	3-025		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	3-026		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	3-027			No Objection	
FF20	3-028		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	3-029			No Objection	
FF22	3-030		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF23	3-031			No Objection	
FF24	3-032		More clarification on the minimum lot sizes for each zoning category would be beneficial to form a better opinion on this. However, I strongly believe we need to incorporate more "Medium" and "High" density zoning across the island. It is not uncommon to find 4000-7000sqft lots in South Florida neighborhoods. Land is a scarcity in the Cayman Islands, it does not make any sense to "waste" land per say, on having such large lots.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-033		There is too much AGR zoning in Cayman, 0.5 of an acre for a house lot is far too large. That is not to say these cannot exist, they have their place and appropriateness for a certain type of living. But reducing our minimum lot sizes would allow for cheaper lots, allowing for low to medium income earners to get on the property ladder.	The Planning Statement is proposing an agricultural zone (AG) instead of an agricultural residential zone to prevent conflicting land use by property owners. In the proposed AG zone, it is intended to be used primarily for agricultural purposes but the Authority and Board will consider single family residences on larger lots along with agricultural related buildings and facilities. Also, the Area Plan process allows for a comprehensive review of all zoning, to ensure an adequate distribution of all zoning categories.	
FF25	3-034		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF26	3-035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	3-036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	3-037			No Objection	
FF29	3-038		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF30	3-039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	3-040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	3-041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	3-042		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF34	3-043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	3-044		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF36	3-045		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	3-046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	3-047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF39	3-048		The Overlay Zones should change the underlying zoning of a site. e.g. Natural Resource Preservation Overlay should be considered more important than any underlying zones that would clear the land.	Overlays aim to require addition considerations in conjunction to the underlying zoning. Zones and overlays especially will give the Authority and Board greater ability to ensure development exercises greater care within a certain area.	
FF40	3-049		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	3-050		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	3-051		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF43	3-052		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF44	3-053		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	3-054		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	3-055			No Objection	
FF47	3-056			No Objection	
FF48	3-057			No Objection	
FF49	3-058			No Objection	
FF50	3-059		Impossible until you are specific on the proposed locations of these zones.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-060		Improving road infrastructure and development also necessitates adequate drainage not for the developments themselves but to minimise further flooding in surrounding neighbourhoods. Lookout Gardens draining into Belford estates an obvious example. By aesthetics, more island style, less Miami-fication (SMB).	Section 5.5 of the draft Planning Statement supports long-range plans for a holistic stormwater Management Plan and seeks to ensure adequate stormwater infrastructure and design standards.	
FF51	3-061		Again, while I think it sounds like a good idea I don't have faith (from experience) that it is accurate or isn't simply PR with empty words.	As outlined in s.1.2 of the draft Planning Statement, the structure of PlanCayman allows for continuous review and community engagement, providing a more manageable process for the Plan review.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF52	3-062		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF53	3-063		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF54	3-064		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	3-065		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	3-066		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	3-067		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	3-068		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	3-069			No Objection	
FF60	3-070		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF61	3-071			No Objection	
FF62	3-072			No Objection	
FF63	3-073		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF64	3-074			No Objection	
FF65	3-075		there is no need to fill in another +25% of the island with property - it will be destroyed government needs to maintain the population where it is, deal with transport and affordable housing issues.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF66	3-076		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF67	3-077		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF68	3-078			No Objection	
FF69	3-079		I have concerns to 4.5. The area government wants to widen, pave, and create parking lot is PRIVATELY OWNED by an individual. It is not gazetted for a road, widening, nor parking lot.	This is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF70	3-080			No Objection	
FF71	3-081		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	3-082			No Objection	
FF73	3-083			No Objection	
FF74	3-084			No Objection	
FF75	3-085		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF76	3-086		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	3-087			No Objection	
FF78	3-088		I attended the Little Cayman PlanCayman meeting. At the meeting it was suggested that an "Environmental Zone" be added to the current list of planning zones and I support that.	The draft Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (section 4.2) which seeks to preserve and protect key habitats, sensitive landscapes and vulnerable ecological areas. This will be achieved by applying additional considerations, mitigation measures and, where appropriate, recommending certain elements for protection.	
FF79	3-089			No Objection	
FF80	3-090		I have 2 main concerns with the Planning Zones, as presented. First, there isn't sufficient clarity on the density permitted, nor sufficient clarity on the use and/or developability of the land in any of the zones. Instead, broad statements are made to give insight into an openness to a higher densification of the land. But, no clear indication is provided. For example, in the Residential Zones (3.3), it is stated that "Minimum lot sizes decrease as the permitted densities increase." However, there is no mention of what lot sizes ought to be in any of the residential zones, nor what density would be permitted. Given the lack of information shared, it is not possible to assess whether this is indeed the best and most appropriate long-term use of land in the Cayman Islands.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-091		Second, while new zones have been created (Estate Residential Zone, Single-family Residential, Transit Industrial, Neighborhood Tourism Zone, etc.), it does not eliminate the ambiguity that exists in the current residential zones, or other zones. Some zones are stated to exist for a specific purpose, but yet different use of land may also be permissible as per the Planning Statement. This ambiguity leads to a complex situation as the use of the land remains uncertain. It further complicates the purchase and develop-ability of the land because the CPA rules are not clear, and too many conditions of development are left to the discretion of the board. Instead, it would have been better if a detailed map was provided that highlighted which areas would be zoned in a specific zone (and which would change), and more details were provided as to what would be permissible in each zone along with unit density, bedroom density, parking, and other requirements.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. A key aspect of the Area Plan approach is that it gives the community greater input into defining the restrictions within each zone and provide more information to decision-makers.	
	3-092		Additionally, there should be a period (say, 5-years) that would serve as a transition period where the previous regulations would apply until a ultimate date where only the new regulations and new zones would be applicable.	Section 3.1 states that the 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning.	
FF81	3-093			No Objection	
FF82	3-094		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	3-095		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	3-096			No Objection	
FF85	3-097			No Objection	
FF86	3-098			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF87	3-099		Agricultural zone: 1. in East End most land is currently zoned Agricultural/Residential. On page 12 it states this new zone will replace the old zone. This should not mean all land currently zoned agricultural/ residential should automatically be zoned Agricultural.	The replacing of AgRes with Agr Zone does not mean all land currently zoned agricultural/ residential will automatically be zoned Agricultural. At the next phase of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will enable a review of where zoning are located within in area, in consultation with the community.	
	3-100		2. All agricultural land is a mixture of soil and rock. In many cases, say 70% will be rock and 30% rocky soil. Why then would you restrict extraction activities? this should be permitted in the rocky areas. This should be permitted.	Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy.	
	3-101		3. Technology is getting better. Much of the rock is limestone which can be scrapped and crushed and then returned which allows programs for improving the land, making soil and ending up with much better land for agriculture. See program at Beacon Farm. This should be permitted.	Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy.	
	3-102		4. Please stipulate that if land is zoned Agricultural, then clearing or farming by mechanical means does not require any permission.	This is to be determined in Development and Planning Regulations.	
	3-103		Coastal Mangrove Buffer: the current conservation plan includes buttonwood as a mangrove which is a stretch. Again, part of the Plan process so be auditing and refreshing any conservation plans purportedly made under section 17 of the NCA.	Outside of the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF88	3-104		I object to the wholesale application of Planning Zones and permissible uses as they relate to Little Cayman. Where I specifically object to them in the other Islands, I make that distinction. Here are my objections: 1. No need for multiple Residential Zones. The only zone that is appropriate is Single Family Residential. To permit other uses will destroy the character of the Island. In relation to the other Islands, particularly Grand Cayman, I note that some "home occupied businesses" may be allowed. How will this be policed to ensure that appropriate licenses are in effect? The DCI, with limited enforcement officers, cannot possibly police private homes as well. To permit home occupied businesses appears patently unfair to business owners who are paying commercial rates for electricity, garbage, etc. along with other costly overheads. Unless this can be absolutely policed by DCI (and I think it cannot), it should not be allowed. The unintended consequence could be that businesses currently using commercial spaces may resort to home businesses where everything is less costly. What impact does that have on a residential area? I think it is a bad idea to "mix business with pleasure" in this regard. It is harsh but we have enough examples of misuses of residential spaces causing nuisances and inconvenience to property owners and we should not be inviting more.	Proposed Zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining which of the zones are necessary and required for each area. This will be determined in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-105		2. No need for Commercial Zones in Little Cayman.		
	3-106		3. Industrial Zones -Heavy Industrial in Little Cayman should be limited to the one parcel that houses the light plant and the dump. Transit Industrial should be limited to the airport (which should remain in its current location), the government dock and exceptions could allow for the Village Square plaza instead of creating the addition of Commercial Zones where further development could change the character of the Island.		
	3-107		4. Community Zones in Little Cayman should be limited to the areas that are currently established as such - the school, church, National Trust Building, etc. with no new zones permitted. It is concerning that area requirements under this zone are left to the discretion of the Authority, especially when planning notices are limited to adjacent landowners and even then, has an imperfect notification system. This objection to the Authority's discretion on area requirements applies to the other Islands as well. Where a discretion is left to the Authority, different planning notifications should be formulated to cover other stakeholders, and not just immediate landowners. For example, if my quiet residential zoning with single family homes suddenly has an imposing structure like a mosque go up, even if my boundary is not within a 1000 ft radius, I am still affected by its presence. I should be allowed to object, especially if the Authority has discretion as to height, set backs and lot size.		
	3-108		5. Tourism Zones - the only zone that should be allowed in Little Cayman is the Resort Residential Zone and current beach resorts should be grandfathered in then lock the door.		
	3-109		6. Open Space Zones - make all of Little Cayman an Open Space Zone. There is too much at stake to not protect, as widely as possible, the indigenous rock iguana, anoles, orchids and other species not found anywhere else in the world.		
	3-110		7. Coastal Mangrove Buffer - Across all 3 Islands but in particular Grand Cayman, whatever is left of this source of life for humans as well as our marine life, please, please guard it and make no exceptions for its disturbance. A more robust and deterrent-based penalty should be formulated and implemented for the disturbance of this valuable asset.		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF89	3-111		Comments, not objections Section 3, Planning Zones. This is the heart of the plan, and detailed specifications will be critical for each area, including Little Cayman. By zone type: Agricultural zone: largely irrelevant to Little Cayman Residential Zones: On Little Cayman only Single Family (SFR) and Low-Density (LDR) are appropriate. The quality of the structures in these zones is important for safety and aesthetic reasons. Homes of whatever type should be hurricane resistant and fit with the character of the island. Structures made by converting shipping containers are inappropriate. Commercial and Industrial zones: both are inappropriate for an island the size of Little Cayman. Community Zones: These are self-defining on Little Cayman. There is one church, one police station and one school which at present has no children. There is a small park outside the single post office. The character of these should be respected and they should be protected from encroaching development. Tourism Zones; Tourism is the main factor in the Little Cayman economy. It needs to be kept at a scale consistent with the capacity of the island. Expanding tourism too much would ultimately damage tourism, because the attraction is the Natural Environment. Therefore, the only type of tourism zone should be "Resort Residential" (RR) as on page 18. Hotel/tourism (HT) or Neighborhood (NT) zones would be inconsistent with preserving the attraction of Little Cayman to tourists and damage the role of Little Cayman in attracting tourists to the Caymans as a whole. Open Space zones: On Little Cayman, after water covered or marshy areas are subtracted, there is surprisingly little open space, and it should be preserved. Much land immediately behind the beaches is privately owned, and beach access should be maintained as it already is at present. Other types of open space should be developed only as needed as indicated by island residents. Discussions of large playing fields, for example, are not useful as they would rarely be used. (subdivision comment needed). Coastal Mangrove Buffer: These are crucial on Little Cayman. Development has already resulted in damage from storms at those locations. The role of other coastal trees, in particularly Sea Grapes, should be recognized and these included as well. The July 2024 storm provided examples of damage resulting in areas where Sea Grapes had been cleared.	Proposed Zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining which of the zones are necessary and required for each area. This will be determined in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF90	3-112			No Objection	
FF91	3-113			No Objection	
FF92	3-114		I strongly believe that in each of the tourism and residential sub-zones that the Planning Document should prescribe the exact maximum elevation of any structure. History indicates that this is one of the most controversial issues of many planning applications. Specifying, for example, that in the less dense residential or tourism zones that the maximum height might be say, 40 feet, while in the high density areas it is unlimited.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF93	3-115			No Objection	
FF94	3-116		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF95	3-117		Cayman Brac is not one of the Planning Zones. Cayman Brac isn't even mentioned in any planning zone discussion.	It is proposed that Cayman Brac will have a separate Area Plan (as outlined in section 1.4 of the draft Planning Statement). During the preparation of the Cayman Brac Area Plan the suitability and location for the zones defined in Section 3 will be considered.	
FF96	3-118			No Objection	
FF97	3-119		Section 3.3. - I find it concerning that certain areas are being deemed 'urban' and only suitable for low-, medium- and high-residential zones, with limitations on single-family dwellings, especially as the use of 'suburb' on the map on pg. 5 suggests that all of West Bay and George Town may be deemed 'urban'. It is, admittedly, hard to comment on this given that the details of proposed zones are not indicated on the map, but there are already concerns in my district of West Bay that there is too much development of large multifamily apartment complexes that are changing the character of neighbourhoods, contributing to flooding, etc. I hope that this will be taken into consideration and the historical agricultural, low-density/single family (or similar) zones will stop being converted into medium- and high-density residential, commercial, etc. zones.	The nature and distribution of each Planning Zone will be determined during the preparation of each Area Plan. This provides an opportunity for zones to be applied in a manner that is more suitable for individual locations. This will be determined in full consultation with stakeholders and the community.	
	3-120		Section 3.7.4.d says 'and, where applicable, ensure unobstructed public access to beaches...' and section 3.7.4.g says 'ensure that waterfront developments be designed to avoid interference with...' but it is time for us as a nation to put a full stop to any tourism or resort residential development directly on the beaches or coastlines and institute far greater setbacks from the water. This needs to be spelled out plainly in the development plan with the creation of coastal buffer zones or similar along all coastlines (in addition to the coastal mangrove buffer). This should include planned retreat from the current setbacks in the case of those buildings which are currently too close and are in danger of sea level rise or are worsening beach erosion.	Section 3.7.4 (g) of the draft Planning Statement seeks to, "ensure that waterfront developments are designed to avoid interference with natural coastal processes and reef systems and incorporate hazard risk reduction measures". Section 5.7(7) states 'Apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations' Coastal setbacks will be considered within each Area Plan. Area Plans - provide an opportunity to set more specific requirements and restrictions depending on the needs, constraints and opportunities of an Area.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF98	3-121		3.7 Tourism Zone on page 17. How is the CPA and Department of Planning going to ensure by way of a criteria or matrix that Tourism Zones do not get preferential treatment over the other zones such as Community Zones, Institutional Zones, Education Zone, and Civic Zones? The reason for the objection is that there has been excessive tourism development that has increased the population due to the labour need and/or demand for tourism. As a result this has caused traffic build up, strain on health and enforcement services. Rather the focus should be on building essential services at an appropriate level which looks at just as the population is increasing so should the facilities needing essentials services i.e. Hospitals, schools, police stations, and fire stations.	<p>The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".</p> <p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.</p>	
FF99	3-122		The plan does not mention in detail how the land usages will be determined and recourse to land owners who may be aggrieved.	<p>Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement states, "As each Area Plan is prepared, the boundaries for Planning Zones and Overlay Zones for that area will be determined and then, once approved, it will create a new section in the overall Zoning Map for the Cayman Islands. Each Area Plan will state how the Authority would apply the zoning considerations within that area (i.e. the maximum building height for a Neighbourhood Commercial zone may vary between different Areas)".</p> <p>Area Plans will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.</p>	
	3-123		There is way too much LDR/Agriculture zoning that drives up the cost of land and housing and no mentioned how that will be brought down. It is concerning that MDR, HDR and commercial land stock is very low, eg very little in Bodden Town which is experiencing the most housing inflows.	<p>The draft Planning Statement acknowledges the challenge of 'supply and Cost of Housing' (section 2.5) along with the need to provide housing for all income levels (section 3.3).</p> <p>The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions within communities along with mixed used developments and vibrant centres (work spaces). Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas via zoning considerations. The Planning Statement, the DoP, CPA and DCB are not responsible for conducting affordable housing needs studies but to create a Development Plan that will support these policies when they are brought forward. Kindly note, The Ministry of Planning, Agriculture, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport and Development (PAHITD) launched a comprehensive survey aimed at gathering valuable insights to inform the development of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan.</p>	
	3-124		There is not enough detail on how the overlay zone designation will work and objections handled.	The Planning Statement is a high-level document that defines the various Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations. These will be applied, with more detail, in each of the Area Plans.	
FF100	3-125		No Objection		
FF101	3-126		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF102	3-127		Page 17 hotel tourism zone on seven mile beach (SMB). As a staff member of building control from 2005-2010 reviewing construction plans, I observed the allowable height increase over time from 3 to 5 to 7 to 10 story structures. The economic and tourism related demands for this evolution have not gone away, if anything they are more pressing now than ever before. The southern end of SMB is experiencing a loss of beachfront due to hard surface construction at the tide line. To allow for existing development to be replaced with structures further back from the shore going higher in stories is the only mitigation strategy that make economic feasibility. In this one zone, I would propose to allow unlimited height development dictated by market conditions on the approval of adequate coastal setback considerations. There is no more land to be had here and to restore the beach, structures must be relocated in a reasonable economic manner.	<p>Section 3.7.4 (g) of the draft Planning Statement seeks to, "ensure that waterfront developments are designed to avoid interference with natural coastal processes and reef systems and incorporate hazard risk reduction measures". Section 5.7(7) states 'Apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations'</p> <p>Coastal setbacks and building heights will be considered within each Area Plan. Area Plans - provide an opportunity to set more specific requirements and restrictions depending on the needs, constraints and opportunities of an Area.</p>	
FF103	3-128		No Objection		
FF104	3-129		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF105	3-130		No Objection		
FF106	3-131		No Objection		
FF107	3-132		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF108	3-133		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF109	3-134		The Planning Statement gives the CPA 'certain powers of discretion' to interpret policies, without defining how those policies apply to specific areas of the Cayman Islands. We are told this will be defined in the Area Plans, but as those don't exist yet, it's hard to provide feedback on how the zones will balance out on a national level. It's concerning how much power the CPA will have to overrule when zoning when they choose.	Each Area Plan will be prepared with full consultation with the community and, once prepared, Area Plans will provide more evidence and information to assist decision-makers. Flexibility does not permit changing of zones (that is a process called 'Rezone' which is an amendment to the Development Plan). Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	
FF110	3-135		Add incentives to all sections to incorporate renewable energy for new construction but specifically, commercial must include at least a minimum % of renewable energy.	Noted. The National Planning Framework acknowledged that incentives could be considered (such as revised regulations or simplified planning processes) to encourage renewable energy development, such as solar panels, wind turbines etc. These issues are therefore recognised and supported, but are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document.	
	3-136		Where buildings are taller than 5 stories, impose additional setbacks to increase with each story to ensure the natural processes are retained to not block out natural light or breeze to support overall quality of life. Many towns and cities are demolishing and increasing space between mass development.	Setback and building heights will be considered at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	3-137		3.3.5 - add...consideration of shadowing and light pollution (consider setting lumens, shadow casting assessments and noise decibel limits). Add financial penalty and enforcement to this section.	The term 'nuisance/annoyance' is included in this section, in terms of land use impacts on surrounding residents. This is considered sufficient for this high-level section.	
	3-138		3.3.7 - The Authority may permit large-lot MULTI-GENERATIONAL family residences in ER zones *definition needed of multi-generational ie directly related parents, children, grand children etc	The draft Planning Statement indicates that "the Authority may permit large-lot single-family residences in ER zones. Duplexes and multifamily residences are prohibited in these zones". Multi-family residences are not multi-generational residences, and instead are a classification of housing where multiple separate housing units for residential inhabitants are contained within one building or several buildings within one complex. Estate Residential zones are intended to be very low density, typically located outside of urban areas. The approach to multi-generational residences in this zone will be considered by the Authority.	NOTE: CPA to consider approach to multi-generational homes in ER Zone.
	3-139		3.3.10 - Height limit of 3-stories for Low-Density Residential. Studies, offices, recreation rooms should be counted as bedrooms!	Height limits will be determined by the people during Area Plan consultations which will also inform desired character of each indicative area.	
	3-140		3.3.11 & 12 - Consider height limits for higher density that is in character with the surrounding area.	This will be determined at the next phase of the Development Plan process - Area Plans.	
FF111	3-141			No Objection	
FF112	3-142		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF113	3-143		We're missing an opportunity to build "complete" neighbourhoods by insisting on separating retail from residential. Have a (small) grocery/liquor/hardware store within walking distance of someone's residence will reduce car traffic, encourage walking and create a more social community where people can interact with one another on their way to and from amenities. Add some trees and maybe a couple of benches and you have to backbones of a real community gathering place.	The Planning Statement supports the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.	
FF114	3-144		see the previous answer.	noted	
FF115	3-145		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF116	3-146		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF117	3-147		In my opinion the cart is before the horse. How can a country decide on a development plan before first having the following in place:- 1)The zoning area in place	For many years attempts have been made to update the development plan in one go which has failed to materialise. We are currently taking an aggregated approach broken down into phases as explained in Section 1.3 of the Planning Statement. The Area Plans fall in the next stage which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-148		2) The population carrying capacity	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF118	3-149		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	3-150		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	3-151		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF121	3-152			No Objection	
FF122	3-153		Zoning agriculture- this should be maintained and should be the majority of the island with low density housing included.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning of parcels, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-154		Commercial properties such as shopping malls should be based in specific areas- we already have Countryside Shopping center near us and yet Alt is trying to develop 70 acres of land with mangroves and wildlife into a housing development with commercial buildings!! We already have issues with traffic let alone another 500 people moving in!! It should not be allowed.	Area Plans fall in the next stage which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-155		Hotels and apartmentwnts should be 2 or 3 storeys-we are a tiny island wedding not need skyscrapers	Area Plans fall in the next phase which will detail parcel zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF123	3-156		Great idea to have planning zones and overlays and we need the area plan to be a priority for Little Cayman	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-157		Little Cayman should only have very low density zone, low volume and low rise reinforcement, while respecting the many protected areas on the islands (wet or in land) The Cayman Islands would want to keep Little Cayman special, therefore with its own planning board being able to act accordingly while respecting the general Little Cayman community concerns of protecting the untouched character of the Island.	Area Plans fall in the next stage which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF124	3-158		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	3-159		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	3-160			No Objection	
FF127	3-161		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF128	3-162		Appropriate use of land needs to be defined more clearly.	The role of the Planning Statement is to define the various Zones, Overlays and other Policy Considerations. Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to apply these zones to different parts of the Cayman Islands, based on local needs and constraints.	
FF129	3-163		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF130	3-164		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF131	3-165			No Objection	
FF132	3-166		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF133	3-167		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF134	3-168		I agree with the LCPRG response that “Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would likely only be appropriate in limited areas.” To which I would add on MDR – if there. Also, since many of the Planning Zones terms, e.g., “light/low, medium, and high/heavy” are relative and context-dependent with possibly very different quantitative definitions in Grand and Little, we might try to put some numbers on what we mean for Little in the next phase.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF135	3-169		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF136	3-170			No Objection	
FF137	3-171		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF138	3-172		Little Cayman does not need the same zoning as GC or Brac. We certainly do not need High Density Residential (HDR) nor General Commercial (GC). Not sure where this may apply to, but a moratorium should be put on any further subdivisions and destruction of land until sanitation and the water Lense has planned here.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF139	3-173		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF140	3-174		Poor planning.	Noted. The Development Plan review seeks to provide more evidence and information to support decision-makers.	
FF141	3-175		As the particularity of Little Cayman, only a few categories actually apply to the Island. There are no Agricultural Zones or Industrial zones, keeping the commercial zone to its sensible minimum with the neighbourhood commercial zone applying for Blossom village As for the Residential zones, would object to the medium and high-density residential zones, as well as Estate if Little Cayman wants to stay special. Single family and low-density residential zones would be the only categories fitting for Little Cayman. As for Tourism, the Island already has the area of where the small resorts are and should remain that way, not to open any other section of the island to major Tourism zone. As there is no zoning in place for Little Cayman yet, it is important that the exercise is put in place sooner than later, with priority and, as described in page 3 with a continuous review and community engagement.	Noted. The purpose of the Planning Statement is to define the various Zones and Overlays. During the next phase, the preparation of Area Plans, the relevant Zones and Overlays can be applied to each area, depending on its particular needs and constraints.	
FF142	3-176		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF143	3-177		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF144	3-178		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF145	3-179		Not as pertains to Grand Cayman. My concern is Little Cayman which is currently a work in progress.	Comment noted.	
FF146	3-180		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF147	3-181		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF148	3-182		Don't destroy L.C.with HDR and GC	<p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p> <p>The Area Plan approach provides a mechanism for the community within in each area to have greater input into the Plan Review process.</p>	
FF149	3-183		Little Cayman should have its own planning board and proper enforcement!!!	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF150	3-184		A		
FF151	3-185		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF152	3-186		Zoning is not good practice. Most countries with foward thinking planning are not doing zoning. There is no zone for environmentally sensitive areas and the overlay zones don't change anything, the CPA just 'may make recommendations'.	<p>Section 1.3.1 of the draft Planning Statement explains that land use planning through the identification of Zones provides a means of organising between competing and sometimes conflicting uses of land and property and allows for the orderly development of land to ensure a balance between different activities.</p> <p>The draft Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay which seeks to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features. These will be applied to different locations during the preparation of Area Plans and will provide more evidence and information for decision-makers.</p>	
FF153	3-187			No Objection	
FF154	3-188		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF155	3-189		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF156	3-190		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF157	3-191		The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that 'the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required'. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman. Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is 'a unique island' and therefore 'Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life'. That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today.	<p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p> <p>The establishment of a Planning Board for Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement</p>	
	3-192		Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB may consider 'free enterprise' to be the priority for the Brac, but 'nature' should be the priority for Little Cayman and 'development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman'.	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
	3-193		Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted in the box on page 4 would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would likely only be appropriate in limited areas. Tourism should be low-volume, stay over tourism. Tourism should be 'quiet' nature oriented and highlight the unique wildlife, dark skies and diving. Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged, and limits on total footfall should be considered.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-194		In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to 'the Board' retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands' Area Plans. As drafted, this seems to give too much discretion to the DCB (as defined on page 2). Please consider deleting that last paragraph and re-wording it as follows: "It is noted that until Area Plans are established for each of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands have no planning zones or regulations as such, and the DCB will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan (Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman). As those Appendices are themselves dated from 1975 and 1977, the Area Plans for the Sister Islands should be a priority. It is also recognized that not all of the proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands."	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	<p>Amend section 3.1 as follows:</p> <p>"The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u></p> <p>This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u>, which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u>, through the preparation of Area Plans."</p>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF158	3-195		The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that ‘the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required’. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman. Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’. That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. The establishment of a Planning Board for Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	3-196		Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB should consider ‘nature’ s the priority for Little Cayman and ‘development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman’ .	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
	3-197		Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would likely only be appropriate in limited areas.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF159	3-198			No Objection	
FF160	3-199		I disagree with this section on page 11: “The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, through the preparation of Area Plans.” Planning should not be more flexible in the Sister Islands. On the contrary: the Sister Islands need more precise and clear outlining and protection to preserve the unique character of these islands.	During the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan, flexibility will be applied in the Sister Islands due to their uniqueness. Area Plans will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. Zones listed in the Planning Statement may/may not be applied and may also be tweaked to be more tailored to the needs of the people within the indicative areas	
FF161	3-200		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF162	3-201		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF163	3-202		The sister islands should have their own DP Board to determine which zones are appropriate for the sister islands.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	3-203		The priorities of GC are for example very different from those of LC. Planning Zones for LC should be low impact, low density and low rise.	Noted. This will be addressed at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan	
FF164	3-204		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF165	3-205		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF166	3-206			No Objection	
FF167	3-207		Page 11, Not all Zones are appropriate for Little Cayman and this should be applied for its Area Plan.	The purpose of the Planning Statement is to define the various Zones and Overlays. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will determine which zones and overlays are appropriate for different locations. Area Plans will be prepared with full public consultation.	
	3-208		Page 19, CMB - The considerations for Coastal Mangrove Buffer are extremely scant and weak. The same prohibitions included in other Zones should be applied for CMB including prohibition of aggregate abstraction. In addition a complete prohibition of any disturbance to the natural state in a CMB Zone should be included.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to set out proposed zoning options/class and broad policies. It is suggested that additional policy can be added to section 3.9 and any more in-depth requirements will be addressed in the Planning Regulations. Currently, Section 18 of the Development and Planning Regulations (2024 Rev.) stipulates detailed policy surrounding Mangrove Buffer Zones by which the CPA is guided.	Amend s.3.9 as follows" <u>“Coastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB)</u> <i>The Authority shall apply the Coastal Mangrove Buffer policies, and any other relevant policies of this Planning Statement, to ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development , <u>except in exceptional circumstances</u> .”</i>
	3-209		A further Zone for Critical Mangrove Habitat should be added to reserve mangrove areas to continue to act as critical drainage areas and provide carbon sequestration.	The Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features, and also includes the Coastal Mangrove Buffer.	
	3-210		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF168	3-211			No Objection	
FF169	3-212		I do not disagree with the zoning categories but I would add that Little Cayman is a whole different ball game and cannot be seen as the same as Grand Cayman or Cayman Brac. We need an area plan for Little Cayman that takes account of this.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF170	3-213			No Objection	
FF171	3-214			No Objection	
	3-215		Not necessarily an objection to the concept of neighbourhood commercial, but should be considered that having mixed used developments. ie highstreet businesses with one or two floors above them serving as residential, near housing of mixed cost, often proves to be the most valuable when the businesses are within walking distances of the residents in the area. Euclidian zoning deems that such zones should remain seperate, but truly effective and efficient community design allows for those living in residential areas to access their basic needs and wants within their own neighbourhoods, negating the need for usage of cars and thereby reducing traffic.	The Planning Statement supports the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via ‘Neighbourhood Commercial’ zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF172	3-216		Walkability is a massive factor to consider as well, in that proper planning of such can reduce traffic an improve quality of health and life for residents in the area, and should be considered in the development of all residential areas.	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability and promoting alternate forms of transportation as highlighted in Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement. The Area Plan approach will provide a mechanism for the community within in each area to have greater input into the Plan Review process.	
	3-217		Also to be considered in these areas is the oncorporation of green spaces for the public to use, as well as shading of safe sidewalks for people to be able to walk safely and cooly in our Caymanian Context.	Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 5.5 and 5.9 of The Planning Statement support a mix of housing solutions, access to services, community facilities and open spaces through the suggested zones and policy considerations.	
FF173	3-218		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF174	3-219			No Objection	
FF175	3-220		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF176	3-221		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF177	3-222		Page 11 3.1 a. - What are the certain powers given to the authorities?	Discretion as mentioned in 3.1(a) speaks to flexibility that can be exercised by the CPA and DCB. Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	
	3-223		Last paragraph - Why are the sister islands not worthy of their own planning zones?	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-224		Page 12 More information is needed on the designation of class 1 and 2 agricultural zones. If I didn't attend mister [REDACTED] Meetings I would not have clarification on this as it was not discussed at the actual Plan Cayman meeting	Section 3.1 of the National Planning Framework explains that a study by the University of the West Indies (Agricultural Land Capability of the Cayman Islands 1996) identified significant class 1 and 2 lands. The CPA, DCB and DoP will work in collaboration with DOA to provide clear designation of the classes.	
	3-225		Page 13 Clarification on restriction for home occupied businesses	The National Planning Framework s3.2 provides examples of typical home occupied businesses which includes home offices, private music lessons, hairstyling, and some small manufacturing.	
	3-226		Estate Residential Zones - Please review as this makes no sense, An estate typically implies that you have multiple generations living on a property, as well as employees who tend to the Estate... multiple acres and multiple properties on that acreage. (Google = An extensive area of land in the country, usually with a large house (and accessory buildings for caretakers etc.), owned by 1 person, family, or organization). Apartments and condos should be prohibited in this zone, Not Duplexes and multifamily residences! Estates like farms and wineries will sometime have separate cottages or facilities for the Estate managers or visiting guest, relatives etc. Why should it be a prohibited to build it like a duplex?	Estate Residential zones are intended to be very low density, typically located outside of urban areas. The approach to multi-generational residences in this zone will be considered by the Authority.	NOTE: CPA to consider approach to multi-generational homes in ER zones.
	3-227		Page 14/15 How Is Planning able to determine the amount of adequate supply of commercial land that will meet market demand in the commercial and industrial zones?	Area Plan preparation will include an assessment and inventory of vacancy rates within existing zoning categories. This combined with consultation with stakeholders should provide a calculation of supply against all zoning categories.	
	3-228		Page 18 g. What hazard risk reduction measures will be incorporated in waterfront developments?	In addition to Section 5.7(7) which states, 'Apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations', the CPA, DCB and DoP will rely on government approved polices and research to inform the Development Plan such as Stormwater Management Plan, Coastal Setback Line Project, etc. The draft Planning Statement also proposes the introduction of a 'Sensitive Coastline Overlay' - Section 4.6.	
FF178	3-229		See general feedback and comments (rather than specific objections)	Noted	
FF179	3-230			No Objection	
FF180	3-231		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	3-232		Drafting comment: In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to 'the Board' retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands' Area Plans. As drafted, this seems to give too much discretion to the DCB (as defined on page 2).	Planning zones can provide certain flexibility as is appropriate for a given location and zoning category. This will still be under broader zoning requirements that enable orderly development. The distribution of zones within the Sister Islands will be determined in consultation with the community. Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF181	3-233		Please consider deleting that last paragraph and re-wording it as follows: “It is noted that until Area Plans are established for each of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands have no planning zones or regulations as such, and the DCB will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan (Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman).	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	Amend section 3.1 as follows: "The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u> which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u> through the preparation of Area Plans ."
	3-234		As those Appendices are themselves dated from 1975 and 1977, the Area Plans for the Sister Islands should be a priority.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-235		It is also recognized that not all of the proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands.”	The Planning Statement is a high-level document that defines the various Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations. These will be applied, with more detail, in each of the Area Plans.	
	3-236		General comment: The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that ‘the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required’. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman.	The Planning Statement is drafted to incorporate all 3 islands whilst factoring in flexibility, acknowledging that each island will have unique needs. PlanCayman also proposes separate Area Plans for each of the Sister Islands to meet the particular needs of each of those places.	
	3-237		Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’. That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	3-238		Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB may consider ‘free enterprise’ to be the priority for the Brac, but nature should be the priority for Little Cayman and ‘development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman’.	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
	3-239		Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas. Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories (HDR, GC, HI, HT) would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas. Tourism should be of the existing low-volume type, overwhelmingly stay-over tourism rather than e.g. cruise ship tourism, given the clear evidence that stay-over tourism supports and is supported by environmentally unique and sensitive areas. Tourism should also be ‘quiet’ and nature orientated, highlighting the pristine reef environment, unique wildlife such as the Sister Islands Rock Iguana, abundant bird-watching, and clear views of the Milky Way in the night skies, and discouraging jet-skis for example so that the marine life is not disturbed (as supported by evidence from the CCMi Quiet Oceans Project), and snorkelers are not injured (as has happened on Grand).	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-240		Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged, and limits on total footfall of visitors and residents should be considered.	Noted. Section 5.5 is proposed to be amended. Any more specific approaches to street lighting in Little Cayman that would be needed to support this can be considered in the Area Plan. Measures to restrict footfall / visitors are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> <u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u> <u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u> <u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>
	3-241		All of these tourism efforts would keep Little Cayman the unique biodiverse site that it is, unparalleled in the Cayman Islands, the Caribbean, and the world. As stated in Appendix 2 of the 1997 Development Plan: ‘Special care must be taken to avoid indiscriminate opening up of [Little Cayman] if prime assets are not to be lost’.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF182	3-242		Page 11 last paragraph: In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to ‘the Board’ retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands’ Area Plans. As drafted, this seems to give too much discretion to the DCB (as defined on page 2).	Planning zones can provide certain flexibility as is appropriate for a given location and zoning category. This will still be under broader zoning requirements that enable orderly development. The distribution of zones within the Sister Islands will be determined in consultation with the community. Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	
	3-243		Please consider deleting that last paragraph and re-wording it as follows: “It is noted that until Area Plans are established for each of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands have no planning zones or regulations as such, and the DCB will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan (Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman).	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	Amend section 3.1 as follows: "The <i>In Grand Cayman the</i> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <i>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</i> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <i>determination of</i> , which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, will occur through the preparation of Area Plans."
	3-244		As those Appendices are themselves dated from 1975 and 1977, the Area Plans for the Sister Islands should be a priority.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-245		It is also recognized that not all of the proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands.”	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-246		General Comment: What is critical is that the Area Plan for Little Cayman should be developed with input mostly from Little Cayman residents and property owners with a separate Planning Board.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	3-247		Despite its still small size, it should be recognized that Little Cayman now has a large enough population and provides enough economic impact to have an Area Plan developed by those people by and for themselves just as the other areas indicated in Figure 1.2 and consistent with the vision and objectives of sections 1.5 and 1.6.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-248		The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that ‘the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required’. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman. Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’. That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF183	3-249		Section 3.9 in the PlanCayman framework does not highlight. The ways in which mangroves would be sufficiently protected from over development. Seeing that there are overly ambitious plans for mixed use development in areas by which came out it does not have land to support. While it is stated within this section that land covering CMB, there would not be any development.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to set out proposed zones and broad policies. More in-depth policy initiatives will be addressed in the Planning Regulations. Currently, Section 18 of the Development and Planning Regulations (2024 Rev.) stipulates detailed policy surrounding Mangrove Buffer Zones by which the CPA is guided.	
	3-250		It is not clear as to how this is zoning would be sufficient and clearly planned out. Who is to say that the zoning proposed does include or does not include mangroves that are pivotal to our sustainable, living and continuation of our culture and environment.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF184	3-251		Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-252		In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to ‘the Board’ retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands’ Area Plans. As drafted, this seems to give too much discretion to the DCB (as defined on page	Planning zones can provide certain flexibility as is appropriate for a given location and zoning category. This will still be under broader zoning requirements that enable orderly development. The distribution of zones within the Sister Islands will be determined in consultation with the community. Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF185	3-253		2). Please consider deleting that last paragraph and re-wording it as follows: “It is noted that until Area Plans are established for each of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands have no planning zones or regulations as such, and the DCB will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan (Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman).	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	Amend section 3.1 as follows: "The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u> which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u> through the preparation of Area Plans."
	3-254		As those Appendices are themselves dated from 1975 and 1977, the Area Plans for the Sister Islands should be a priority.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-255		It is also recognized that not all of the proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands."	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-256		General comment: The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that ‘the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required’. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands.	
	3-257		Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	3-258		That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today. Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB may consider ‘free enterprise’ to be the priority for the Brac, but nature should be the priority for Little Cayman and ‘development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman’.	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
	3-259		PLANNING ZONES Agriculture Agricultural Zone (AG) Residential Estate Residential (ER) Single-family Residential (SFR) Low-Density Residential (LDR) Medium-Density Residential (MDR) ** rare and in limited areas on Little Cayman ** High-Density Residential (HDR) ** not appropriate for Little Cayman ** Commercial General Commercial (GC) ** not appropriate or needed for Little Cayman ** Neighbourhood Commercial (NC) Marine Commercial (MC) Industrial Light Industrial (LI) Heavy Industrial (HI) ** not appropriate for Little Cayman ** Transit Industrial (TI) Community Institutional Zone (INS) Education Zone (EDU) Civic Zone (CZ) Tourism Hotel/Tourism (HT) ** not appropriate or needed for Little Cayman ** Resort Residential (RR) Neighbourhood Tourism (NT) Open Space Public Open Space (POS) Community Open Space (COS) Coastal Coastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB) Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted with asterisks above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas. Tourism should be of the existing low-volume type, overwhelmingly stay-over tourism rather than e.g. cruise ship tourism, given the clear evidence that stay-over tourism supports and is supported by environmentally unique and sensitive areas. Tourism should also be ‘quiet’ and nature orientated, highlighting the pristine reef environment, unique wildlife such as the Sister Islands Rock Iguana, abundant bird-watching, and clear views of the Milky Way in the night skies, and discouraging jet-skis for example so that the marine life is not disturbed (as supported by evidence from the CCMI Quiet Oceans Project), and snorkelers are not injured (as has happened on Grand).	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-260		Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged,	Noted. Section 5.5 is proposed to be amended. Any more specific approaches to street lighting in Little Cayman that would be needed to support this can be considered in the Area Plan.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> 12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources; 13. <u>Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u> 14. <u>Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-261		and limits on total footfall of visitors and residents should be considered.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	3-262		All of these tourism efforts would keep Little Cayman the unique biodiverse site that it is, unparalleled in the Cayman Islands, the Caribbean, and the world. As stated in Appendix 2 of the 1997 Development Plan: 'Special care must be taken to avoid indiscriminate opening up of [Little Cayman] if prime assets are not to be lost'.	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
FF186	3-263		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF187	3-264		Some of these planning zones would be inappropriate on Little Cayman (High Density Residential (HDR), General commercial (GC), Heavy Industrial (HI), and Hotel Tourism (HT)) might be examples.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-265		rules for house size and design and a tourism plan that limits the number of tourists per year should be a requirement.	Area Plans will facilitate building height, setback and site coverage restrictions also as stated in s5.6.3 of the Planning Statement the Authority/Board will "encourage appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses".	
	3-266		And no cruise ships of any kind.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
FF188	3-267		1. Do we the public have a say in how zones will be set within the Area Plans?	Each indicative area as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an Area Plan which will be unique, outlining character through zoning. Area Plans will be prepared with full public consultation.	
	3-268		2. In regards to LPP'S is there going to be any enforcement in relation to how these are being used? They are on the plans but who is going to be behind the developers to ensure it happens? How will they be enforced to stay LPP?	Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement seeks to better utilize LLP's.Goal 11.3 of the National Planning Framework outlines some of the measures that could be undertaken to achieve this.	
FF189	3-269		As noted on page 11 under the Introduction to Planning Zones, it states the Planning Zones identified will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands. I think the Sister Islands need their own independent Planning Zones, separate from Grand Cayman; and that Little Cayman's Planning Zones should be different to those for Cayman Brac, as Cayman Brac has become much more developed, which is not the intention for Little Cayman.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-270		On page APP.2-1, of Appendix 2, of The Development Plan 1977, Guidelines for Development Control in Little Cayman, in the first paragraph it states 'the Tribunal recommended that specific guidelines were needed for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman". This is key proof that Planning Zones for Little Cayman need to take priority in being formulated over any other district in the Cayman Islands, as Little Cayman does not have any Plan at present that the Central Planning Board can refer to when it comes to applications being made for Little Cayman, and it shouldn't be fair that applications have to be reviewed under planning regulations made for Grand Cayman.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-271		On page APP.2-2, under (ii), it states "Little Cayman is considered a unique island. Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character" "Development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the island." This echos my sentiment for immediate action for a separate Planning Board for Little Cayman with Zones prioritising low density and low impact. Naturally, any of the proposed Planning Zones in the Table found on page 4 of The Planning Statement, that relate to high impact would not be suitable to Little Cayman: i.e. Medium-Density Residential; High Density Residential; Heavy Industrial; and Hotel/Tourism.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF190	3-272		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF191	3-273		In the introduction on page 11, the draft states "The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, through the preparation of Area Plans." This seems a bit vague. I speak as someone with PR status in the Cayman Islands and a home on Little Cayman, but I know many on Little Cayman share with me the concern that our unique natural environment needs to be protected. As such, I should think there would be greater effort to come to some more specific guidance regarding zones/development on Little Cayman (and likely Cayman Brac).	During the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan, flexibility will be applied in the Sister Islands due to their uniqueness. Area Plans will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. Zones listed in the Planning Statement may/may not be applied and may also be tweaked to be more tailored to the needs of the people within the indicative areas	
FF192	3-274			No Objection	
FF193	3-275			No Objection	
FF194	3-276		Again, Little Cayman needs its own wording. Planning zones: We should be low density housing anything else would be inappropriate. Tourism should continue to be low volume due to the unique environment on Little Cayman	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. The role of the Planning Statement is to define the Zones, Overlays and other Policy Considerations. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will apply these zones and overlays, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-277		The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that 'the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required'. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman.	We are currently undertaking the process to have the current Development Plan updated which will for the first time include zoning for all 3 islands.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF195	3-278		Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’.	The establishment of a Planning Board for Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	3-279		That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today. Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB may consider ‘free enterprise’ to be the priority for the Brac, but nature should be the priority for Little Cayman and ‘development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman’.	In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.	
	3-280		<p>PLANNING ZONES Agriculture Agricultural Zone (AG) Residential Estate Residential (ER) Single-family Residential (SFR) Low-Density Residential (LDR) Medium-Density Residential (MDR) High-Density Residential (HDR) Commercial General Commercial (GC) Neighbourhood Commercial (NC) Marine Commercial (MC) Industrial Ight Industrial (LI) Heavy Industrial (HI) Transit Industrial (TI) Community Institutional Zone (INS) Education Zone (EDU) Civic Zone (CZ) Tourism Hotel/Tourism (HT) Resort Residential (RR) Neighbourhood Tourism (NT) Open Space Public Open Space (POS) Community Open Space (COS) Coastal Eoastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB) Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas. Tourism should be of the existing low-volume type, overwhelmingly stay-over tourism rather than e.g. cruise ship tourism, given the clear evidence that stay-over tourism supports and is supported by environmentally unique and sensitive areas. Tourism should also be ‘quiet’ and nature orientated, highlighting the pristine reef environment, unique wildlife such as the Sister Islands Rock Iguana, abundant bird-watching, and clear views of the Milky Way in the night skies, and discouraging jet-skis for example so that the marine life is not disturbed (as supported by evidence from the CCM Quiet Oceans Project), and snorkelers are not injured (as has happened on Grand). Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged, and limits on total footfall of visitors and residents should be considered. All of these tourism efforts would keep Little Cayman the unique biodiverse site that it is, unparalleled in the Cayman Islands, the Caribbean, and the world. As stated in Appendix 2 of the 1997 Development Plan: ‘Special care must be taken to avoid indiscriminate opening up of [Little Cayman] if prime assets are not to be lost’.</p>	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. The role of the Planning Statement is to define the Zones, Overlays and other Policy Considerations. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will apply these zones and overlays, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF196	3-281		Planning zones for Little Cayman should be aiming at low density, low impact, low rise across the island. The highest density categories are not appropriate and are unnecessary in Little Cayman.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. The role of the Planning Statement is to define the Zones, Overlays and other Policy Considerations. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will apply these zones and overlays, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF197	3-282		In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to ‘the Board’ retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands’ Area Plans. As it stands written at the moment this seems to put too much weight on the board when no area plans are currently available. Please consider updating this wording to read as something more along the lines of the below: It should be noted that without the establishment of Area Plans for Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands currently lack specific planning zones or regulations. The Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed. -----	<p>Zoning for the Sister Islands will be determined during the preparation of Area Plans, in full consultation with the community.</p> <p>The comment regarding amended text for section 3.1 is noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.</p>	Amend section 3.1 as follows: "The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u> which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u> through the preparation of Area Plans."
	3-283		Considering the dated nature of these Appendices (1975 and 1977), it is crucial to prioritise the creation of Area Plans for the Sister Islands.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	3-284		It is also important to acknowledge that not all proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	3-285		A side note here: I would like to kindly request that the people of the sister islands have their own allocated Planning Board that represents and includes individuals residing on the islands.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-286		Little Cayman is arguably still an 'island that time forgot' and, if maintained and developed in a mindful manner, could continue to be so, which in a world filled with busyness and noise, can be a true natural paradise that is not only unique in Cayman, but the wider Caribbean and the world. To quote the wording from plans past, " - 'development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of Little Cayman'. "	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Through the Area Plans, the people of the Cayman Islands will help determine the character and zoning of the indicative areas.	
FF198	3-287		Residential Zones (page 13): I object to the zoning of residential areas versus non-residential areas and the implications it will have on the connectivity, community, and cultural preservation. Historically, land has been developed for commercial and tourism usage within community areas that have not served the community before. It is not appropriate, fair, or just to subject locals to residential "zones" and dictate what they can and cannot build when there are already many barriers through the planning permission process that may filter applications out. Due to the housing crisis, locals should be allowed to build their residential homes wherever they can afford to, given the leniency for high end developments that are not serving the community and taking up significant land usage on culturally significant areas, such as West Bay, Seven Mile Beach, and George Town.	The Cayman Island practices zoned planning and through the Planning Statement, a mix of flexible zoning is being proposed that will allow for not only separating conflicting land uses but also allowing flexibility for mixed-use of compatible land uses.	
FF199	3-288			No Objection	
FF200	3-289		While on the surface the Zoning categories and permissible uses appear to be broadly logical, it is the implementation of the proposed actions - for example in the Community Zones (page 16) the statement that "The policy in respect of proposals for development in Community Zones will be that: 1. ...	Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement explains that Area Plans provide a mechanism to implement the national objectives and policies.	
	3-290		2. Area requirements such as lot sizes, setbacks and height limitations shall be at the discretion of the Authority." that have in the past given and quite possibly in the future will give rise to concern BECAUSE it is not unheard of when discretion is allowed, for the Authority to apply different strokes for different folks.	Flexibility is a recognition that certain site characteristics may require different approaches and variances which can be determined on a case-by-case basis, but under broad zoning requirements.	
FF201	3-291		Page 12 - 3.2 Agricultural Zone My family owns a very large area of what is called "farm" land in East End but only a small portion of it is arable land and of that portion, 50% is covered in rocks, to the point that we are constrained to plant in the small pockets of soil that lie between the rocks and that makes farming very labour intensive and expensive. I believe this is the experience of most - maybe all farmers in the area. In most instances, the type of farming that we do in the Cayman Islands can hardly be called "farming". Without allowing farmers the ability to mechanically remove and dispose of rock to regularize their land in order to replace it with soil, the Cayman Islands will remain grossly under-farmed and we will remain almost totally dependent on imported food supplies. Some people go as far as to say that our inability to feed ourselves is a national security threat. There seems to be some awareness of this because the first paragraph on this page - Page 12, says that farming plays a key role in the Islands food security. Unfortunately, we are not there yet. The sad truth is if ships stopped coming, our farms could not carry us for more than a few weeks.	Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy. Area Plans preparations will provide an opportunity to comprehensively review the application of zoning categories to all parcels.	
	3-292		The reason that more of our family land is not farmed is because of government restrictions. There is no logical reason for prohibiting the removal of ironshore-type rock to 5 feet over the water lens. That would not ruin the water lens. If the rocks could be removed and sold, the proceeds could go towards improving the land to make it productive for farming and other endeavours, which would go a long way towards food security for Cayman. Without realizing it, Government's priorities have not been helpful to farmers for decades. It is illegal to remove rocks off the property without Planning approval. We also need Planning permission to hammer rocks to make the rocks smaller and farming easier. And now we are faced with another problem.	Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy. Area Plans preparations will provide an opportunity to comprehensively review the application of zoning categories to all parcels.	
	3-293		More restrictions will be coming because of the newcomers to our area – the iguanas! I believe that around 2005, they were brought into the area. It is clearly not their natural habitat yet they are given preference over farmers – even though plots of land in the area have been farmed for well over 150 years.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	3-294		Page 13 - 3.3 High Density Residential Zone I am concerned about the density the draft plan is proposing for high density areas / living. If I have time tomorrow, I would like to explain myself better. In case I don't, please be very careful how many people you plan to have living in a very small area. If the density is similar to the slum area in Windsor Park, the people will have nicer accommodation but they will experience the same social problems.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.	
FF202	3-295		High developements in Residential and commercial zones for Little Cayman.	Each indicative area as highlighted in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement will have an Area Plan which will be unique, outlining character through zoning in collaboration with the people.	
FF203	3-296		We do not want any PADS or anything bigger developments on Cayman Brac.	Noted, the Area Plan for Cayman Brac will provide an opportunity for residents to determine the priorities for the island.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF204	3-297		Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas. Tourism should be of the existing low-volume type, overwhelmingly stay-over tourism rather than e.g. cruise ship tourism, given the clear evidence that stay-over tourism supports and is supported by environmentally unique and sensitive areas. Tourism should also be 'quiet' and nature orientated, highlighting the pristine reef environment, unique wildlife such as the Sister Islands Rock Iguana, abundant bird-watching, and clear views of the Milky Way in the night skies, and discouraging jet-skis for example so that the marine life is not disturbed (as supported by evidence from the CCMi Quiet Oceans Project), and snorkelers are not injured (as has happened on Grand). Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged, and limits on total footfall of visitors and residents should be considered. All of these tourism efforts would keep Little Cayman the unique biodiverse site that it is, unparalleled in the Cayman Islands, the Caribbean, and the world.	During the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan, flexibility will be applied in the Sister Islands due to their uniqueness. Area Plans will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. Zones listed in the Planning Statement may/may not be applied and may also be tweaked to be more tailored to the needs of the people within the indicative areas	
FF205	3-298		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF206	3-299		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF207	3-300		The islands are already suffering from massive overdevelopment. The Caymans need a "Preservation Zone" where no development of any kind is allowed and where human interaction and use is limited to interference free activities. This zone should be applied to all current undeveloped land and be impervious to the bags of money developers will offer in order to change such zoning.	The Planning Statement proposes Overlays for areas that require addition considerations and restriction. The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA.	
	3-301		On an island that from the air looks like a massive mess of humans doing whatever they like, wherever they want, large portions of the islands should be set aside as such preservation zones, even enacting eminent domain to take currently undeveloped land away from real estate speculators and greedy developers if needed.	The Planning Statement proposes Overlays for areas that require addition considerations and restriction. The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA.	
	3-302		The planning statement needs to find ways for the country to succeed without continued growth, without continued raping of the diminishing natural resources and limited space.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Through the Area Plans, the people of the Cayman Islands will help determine the character and zoning of the indicative areas.	
FF208	3-303		The proposed zoning is adequate except the agricultural zoning. I agree that it is appropriate to use agricultural zoning for properties that are primarily used for agricultural purposes or have the potential to be used for agriculture because of soil nd terrain characteristics and are located over fresh water lenses. To use agricultural zoning for natural undeveloped properties is not appropriate; for instance the Central Mangrove Wetland is not suitable for agriculture, so why would it have this designation	The list of possible property types that could be zoned AG does not mean that 'all' properties that are undeveloped would have this zoning. The wording in the Planning Statement does not state 'all'. Some undeveloped parcels may be suitable for residential uses and would be considered for that zoning. The list in section 3.2 is stating that properties zoned AG will have 1 of the 3 listed criteria (i.e. will either be undeveloped, or currently used for agriculture, or have potential to be used for agriculture). Also, it may be appropriate for some land in natural undeveloped state, even if i doesn't have agricultural suitability, to be zoned AG because of its correlation contribution to water and soil quality and rustic ambiance	
FF209	3-304			No Objection	
FF210	3-305		1. 3.2 Agricultural Zone (AG) (p.12), 3.4 Commercial Zones (p.14), 3.5 Industrial Zones (p.15) and 3.7 Tourism Zones (p.17 - 18) Ultimately, land for agriculture purposes should be prioritised and promoted over unsustainable development (primarily in West Bay, George Town and Bodden Town). This is to say that the infrastructure development of the country is to not be completely disregarded, but rather better managed, in respects of the country having an enforced food security. Respectively, infrastructure development ties into the growth of the population - and it is unfair to the Caymanian people (generational) to be displaced by a poorly managed growing population of imported labour.	Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use, supporting the Government's Food Security Policy. Area Plans preparations will provide an opportunity to comprehensively review the application of zoning categories to all parcels.	
	3-306		The Government must prioritise and ensure that all remaining coastal properties where there is a sea view is maintained. A line needs to be drawn and enforced to protect all remaining sea views for the wellbeing of the Caymanian people and out of respect for what once was. It is unfair that capital investors and developers can continue to put up skyscrapers along the West Bay and George Town coast, taking away the natural views that negatively impact our people's access to the sea, coastlines and beaches.	The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.	
	3-307		All proposed future developments architecture and design is to be reflective of traditional Cayman. Enough with the glass and painted over concrete looking MineCraft buildings. Have all major capital development have character of Caymanian tradition, design and aesthetics - or which ever is the best terminology to use to emphasise that buildings are to be designed with Caymanian character.	Area Plans will facilitate building height, setback and site coverage restrictions also as stated in s5.6.3 of the Planning Statement the Authority/Board will "encourage appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses".	
FF211	3-308			No Objection	
FF212	3-309		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	3-310			No Objection	
FF214	3-311			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF215	3-312		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	3-313		All very vague, not very detailed or share any metrics of success if and when plans are put in place. Why are there no expansive definitions of different tyes of residential zones i.e. Low-High density mixed used spaces. Needs to clarify how exactly zones will be selected and defined and if public input is necessary. Like what mechanism are there in place? What safeguards are there??	The Planning Statement is just one part of the overall Development Plan. Each Area Plan will include baseline data and key performance indicators. As stated in section 1.4 of the Planning Statement, each Area Plan will state how the Authority/Board will apply the zoning considerations for the Area.	
FF217	3-314		I would add a buffering zone or green belt zone or green corridor zone, that separates the zones from activates that will cause harm, be a nuisance or an issues when they are side by side for example, noise pollution, pollution, air pollution, safety concerns, risk of light pollution, degrade property or other health risks . For example an industrial area next to a residential area or a landfill beside a protected area or park or a farm beside an industrial or commercial site. Corridor zones promote natural areas for sound buffering, shade, possible low impact recreation (walking paths or bike paths, parks) while an area for connectivity and transitioning from one zone to another zone.	NRPO is responsible for identifying important ecosystems which will provide addition considerations for development. Also, section 3.5 of the Planning Statement indicates that industrial properties should have minimal impact on adjacent non-industrial uses.	
	3-315		There should be a inland green zone/buffer that surrounds key sites for conservation, such as protected areas, which would not be covered Coastal Mangrove Buffer.	NRPO is responsible for identifying important ecosystems which will provide addition considerations for development.	
FF218	3-316		I think that the Estate zoning is not an efficient use of land. The agricultural zoning already allows for a single family home on an agricultural lot, so I feel like the only use for the estate lots are to allow megamansions which I don't think should be allowed when we are trying to reduce sprawling and have a housing crisis.	Estate Residential is one of many options available in providing a mix of housing and living solutions. Persons who own large estate properties may apply this zone to their properties. The proposed ER zoning would allow for small agricultural uses which are limited to secondary uses at the site. It is not anticipated that during the area plan phase that this will be heavily used however it is still providing an option to properties that meet the requirement as set out in Section 3.3.8 of the Planning Statement.	
	3-317		I also am worried when it comes to the agricultural zoning on whether the land being useful for agriculture or the land being primary habitat will take precedent. Areas of East End that are agriculturally viable are also some of our last untouched dry forests that hold many of our bird species, such as the endemic bullfinch, and are the habitat for blue iguanas and cayman parrots as well. I would not like to have traditional agriculture's viability favoured over protecting local untouched ecosystems.	The application of the zones and overlays for each parcel will be considered and agreed during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
FF219	3-318		Considering the fact that zoning seems to have a long history of being malleable based on the applications received, it would be good to have some terms set in legislation where the zoning cannot change for say 20 years. Otherwise what's the point? I currently live in a low density neighbourhood and I moved by Barkers thinking I will have some peace and quiet and within 5 years, the some developers are putting up a hotel with neon lighting. Finn is another great example of how residential zoning turns into a circus. It's just a matter of time before someone puts in 10 story condos in our area. Zoning should have minimum term limits and minimum variances when terms are expiring and NO EXCEPTIONS to applications.	Area Plans will facilitate a comprehensive review of zoning for all properties. Once agreed, the zoning can only be changed through an amendment of the Development Plan.	
	3-319		Secondly, does the Marine commercial zone already exist? Please clarify what the MCZ means.	Marine Commercial already exists and is defined under Section 13 of the Development and Planning Regulations (2022 Rev). A brief definition is also highlighted in Section 3.4 of the Planning Statement.	
FF220	3-320			No Objection	
FF221	3-321			No Objection	
FF222	3-322			No Objection	
FF223	3-323			No Objection	
FF224	3-324		page 12. Agricultural Zone. in the eastern districts lands outside the existing residential and tourism areas are currently zoned Agricultural/Residential. Changing suitable terrain areas to Agricultural Zone will depreciate current property values.	Area Plans will facilitate a comprehensive review of zoning for all properties. Once agreed, the zoning can only be changed through an amendment of the Development Plan.	
	3-325		page 13. I don't understand the need for Estate Residential Zone and Single-Family Residential Zone, the anticipated lot sizes in these zones and how they facilitate an appropriate mix of housing for the whole community.	Estate Residential is one of many options available in providing a mix of housing and living solutions. Persons who own large estate properties may apply this zone to their properties. It is not anticipated that during the area plan phase that this will be heavily used but it is still providing an option to properties that meet the requirement as set out in Section 3.3.8 of the Planning Statement.	
	3-326		page 18. I think creating Neighbourhood Tourism and Resort Residential Zones complicates the selection of the zoning process and the parcels within the eventual Area Plans	The aim of the Resort Residential is to provide a transition in character from Hotel Tourism to adjacent residential zones. Neighbourhood Tourism is aimed more at smaller scale less dense tourism related developments. The intention is still to have transitional zoning (Resort Residential) where necessary between the Neighbourhood Tourism and residential zones.	
	3-327		page 19. Coastal Mangrove boundary definition should be changed to the land side of the vegetation and exclude all standing water, which should be Crown property or King's Bottom.	The width of any Coastal Mangrove Buffer zone in any area shall be shown on the zoning map, and will be determined as part of each Area Plan.	
WR1-A	3-328			No Objection	
WR1-B	3-329		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR2	3-330		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR3	3-331		Section 3, Planning Zones. This is the heart of the plan, and detailed specifications will be critical for each area, including Little Cayman. By zone type: Agricultural zone: largely irrelevant to Little Cayman Residential Zones: On Little Cayman only Single Family (SFR) and Low-Density (LDR) are appropriate. The quality of the structures in these zones is important for safety and aesthetic reasons. Homes of whatever type should be hurricane resistant and fit with the character of the island. Structures made by converting shipping containers are inappropriate. Commercial and Industrial zones: both are inappropriate for an island the size of Little Cayman. Community Zones: These are self-defining on Little Cayman. There is one church, one police station and one school which at present has no children. There is a small park outside the single post office. The character of these should be respected and they should be protected from encroaching development. Tourism Zones; Tourism is the main factor in the Little Cayman economy. It needs to be kept at a scale consistent with the capacity of the island. Expanding tourism too much would ultimately damage tourism, because the attraction is the Natural Environment. Therefore, the only type of tourism zone should be "Resort Residential" (RR) as on page 18. Hotel/tourism (HT) or Neighborhood (NT) zones would be inconsistent with preserving the attraction of Little Cayman to tourists and damage the role of Little Cayman in attracting tourists to the Caymans as a whole. Open Space zones: On Little Cayman, after water covered or marshy areas are subtracted, there is surprisingly little open space, and it should be preserved. Much land immediately behind the beaches is privately owned, and beach access should be maintained as it already is at present. Other types of open space should be developed only as needed as indicated by island residents. Discussions of large playing fields, for example, are not useful as they would rarely be used. (subdivision comment needed). Coastal Mangrove Buffer: These are crucial on Little Cayman. Development has already resulted in damage from storms at those locations. The role of other coastal trees, in particularly Sea Grapes, should be recognized and these included as well. The July 2024 storm provided examples of damage resulting in areas where Sea Grapes had been cleared.	Appreciate the comment. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
WR4	3-332	3.1 Introduction	I agree that planning zones should be applied flexibly on LC. It is crucial that residents of LC participate in deciding which zones would be appropriate on the island. Communication and transparency will be required.	Agree. Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation.	
	3-333	3.2 Agricultural Zone	Currently the only "agriculture" on LC is in the form of large vegetable and fruit tree gardens on private property. They do not sell anything they produce. LC is a very small island and cannot support an agriculture industry. An agricultural zone is unnecessary on LC.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-334	3.3 Residential Zones	An island of 10 square miles cannot physically support an Estate Residential Zone, or Medium-Density or High-Density Residential zones. They are inappropriate for LC.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-335		Most homes currently on LC are single family homes this trend should be continued. When apartment complexes are needed, they should be limited to a small number of units, such as 12 or fewer. There are already 2 sets of condominiums present and a third larger one being built. This is enough. LC does not need any more condominiums, which take up a lot of land and increase traffic, fuel, and electricity use. Many of the condos are rented to tourists to provide income for their owners, who do not ever live there. They are not needed for resident housing.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-336		In the past few months, several planning applications to build shipping container homes on LC have been posted on the planning website. Container homes were banned on GC in June 2023 by the Central Planning Authority (CPA). The Authority stated that the containers were "not an appropriate form of housing", would "not enhance the quality of life for persons residing in them", and were not "consistent with the architectural traditions of the islands" (Cayman Compass, June 23, 2023). Most residents of LC agree with the CPA and do not want any form of container homes on LC. These "homes" do not meet the building code and would not survive a hurricane, which makes them particularly inappropriate for island housing. Properly built homes or apartments can be provided instead if they are necessary.	Noted. Section 5.6(5) indicates that building design should meet a minimum level of compliance with various local Building Codes in respect of human safety and accessibility. Section 5.6 (3) encourages appropriate aesthetics, details of which will be determined in the Area Plans	
	3-337	3.4 Commercial Zones	Little Cayman is too small to support commercial zones and the size of the island will not increase in the future.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-338	3.5 Industrial Zones	Little Cayman is too small to support industrial zones and the size of the island will not increase in the future.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-339	3.6 Community Zones	LC currently has one church, 1 clinic, 1 police station, 1 elementary school, 1 museum and 1 National Trust House, which are scattered around the island. For the past 2 years there have been no children living on LC and so no students in the school. The land area of the island is not large enough to add more of these facilities even in the future. A community zone is not needed on LC. Residents already have a feeling of community because the island population is small, and we all know each other.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
	3-340	3.7 Tourism Zones	Little Cayman currently has two resorts, one small hotel of efficiencies, and two resorts that are no longer in business or in use. The island is too small to support high intensity tourist development and neither LC tourists nor residents want the disturbance caused by such activities. We want to encourage peace and quiet and nature-loving tourists. High intensity tourist development would destroy the economic potential LC now provides to the country by maintaining its natural environment. If new resorts/hotels apply for planning permission, LC residents can review the plans and decide on a case-by-case basis whether to support them. Little Cayman does not need and cannot support a tourism zone.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-341	3.8 Open Space Zones	These are not needed on LC now or in the future.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
WR5	3-342			No Objection	
WR6	3-343			No Objection	
WR7	3-344			No Objection	
WR8	3-345			No Objection	
WR9	3-346			No Objection	
WR10	3-347			No Objection	
WR11	3-348	3.3 Residential Zones	We note that this section states that the Central Planning Authority (CPA) “may permit other compatible uses... provided that they are not the primary use of the site and do not cause a significant negative impact on surrounding residences from noise, traffic and other issues.” It would be helpful to clarify whether all applications must include a residential component. For example, if a pharmacy or daycare use is deemed suitable in a residential neighbourhood, is such an application required to include residences?	Noted and agreed. There was an error in drafting and an amendment is proposed to allow for 'other compatible uses' in Residential Zones provided that they do not cause significant negative impact and that the primary use of the zone (not the site) is maintained. This ensures that the wider zone maintains its use and character, but other compatible uses are permitted to occupy the entirety of a single parcel.	In 3.3.2 - Re-word sentence to read " <i>The Authority may permit other compatible uses, such as parks, schools, community buildings, churches, and utility facilities, on a case by case basis, provided that they are not the primary use of the site- and do not cause a significant negative impact on surrounding residences from noise, traffic and other issues <u>and that the primary use of the zone is maintained</u>.</i> "
	3-349	3.4 Commercial Zones	It is noted that the Neighbourhood Commercial Zone is suitable for a mix of commercial and residential uses appropriately assigned as part of an overall development masterplan. The current language appears to be applicable for areas where there are growing commercial hubs in areas like in Savannah. How would this be applied to isolated properties in Neighbourhood Commercial Zones in other established areas like on the Seven Mile Beach corridor?	Noted. The Area Plans phase will provide the comprehensive zoning review that would determine appropriate locations for Neighbourhood Commercial Zones	
	3-350	3.7 Tourism Zones	It is noted under the Hotel Tourism Zone that in these areas proposals for development will need to "ensure adequate and unrestricted public access to the beaches and the sea, including fire and rescue vehicles." It is not clear whether the Public Rights of Way (PROWs) to the sea will be required to be wider than in other zones. How would this impact existing PROWs that by law are prescribed to be six feet wide for every 200 feet of shoreline?	Noted. The Area Plans phase will provide the comprehensive zoning review that would determine appropriate locations for Hotel Tourism Zones. The existing PROW requirements remain in effect until each Area Plan is prepared which will seek to meet this objective.	
	3-351		With reference to providing "for the orderly development, expansion and upgrading of facilities required to maintain a successful tourism industry," how is it envisaged that this will be accomplished?	This will be accomplished through consultation with stakeholders at the Area Plan preparation phase.	
	3-352	3.9 Coastal Mangrove Buffer	It is noteworthy that the drafters of the Planning Statement have included provisions for the retention of the existing Mangrove Buffer under a re-titled "Coastal Mangrove Buffer. It would be useful to learn how the 300' buffer was originally determined. If the Plan proposes to modify the buffer width, the reasoning behind the change should be provided. Also, will the 'exceptional circumstances' condition be included in the proposed plan? Any recommendations to modify the width should be supported by scientific study.	Noted. The width of any Coastal Mangrove Buffer zone in any area shall be shown on the zoning map and will be reviewed as part of the preparation of each Area Plan. This will include evidence / reasoning behind the original 300' buffer and whether any local characteristics or conditions exist which would warrant a review of this.	
WR12	3-353			No Objection	
WR13	3-354			No Objection	
WR14	3-355		<p>In the Introduction, the last paragraph of section 3.1 refers to ‘the Board’ retaining flexibility and determining which zones might apply in the Sister Islands’ Area Plans. As drafted, this seems to give too much discretion to the DCB (as defined on page 2). Please consider deleting that last paragraph and re-wording it as follows:</p> <p>“It is noted that until Area Plans are established for each of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, the Sister Islands have no planning zones or regulations as such, and the DCB will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan (Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman). As those Appendices are themselves dated from 1975 and 1977, the Area Plans for the Sister Islands should be a priority. It is also recognized that not all of the proposed Planning Zones will be appropriate for the Sister Islands.”</p>	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	Amend section 3.1 as follows: " The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u> , which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u> through the preparation of Area Plans."
	3-356		The 1997 Development Plan states in Appendix 1 that ‘the people of Little Cayman and Cayman Brac believe that a system of free enterprise is best suited to their needs at this early stage. A flexible set of guidelines is required’. This is no longer the case, at least for Little Cayman. Instead, Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board in order to prioritize the wording from Appendix 2 in clause 6(b)(ii) which recognizes that Little Cayman is ‘a unique island’ and therefore ‘Every effort should therefore be made to retain its unspoiled character and to make it an attraction for persons interested in natural life’. That wording was as true in 1975 as it is today. Until the Area Plans are established, the DCB may consider ‘free enterprise’ to be the priority for the Brac, but nature should be the priority for Little Cayman and ‘development should be in harmony with the unspoiled character of the Little Cayman’.	<p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p> <p>The establishment of a Planning Board for Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement</p>	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-357		<p>Planning zones for Little Cayman should aim for low impact, low density and low rise across the island. Each of the highest density categories highlighted above would be inappropriate and unnecessary in Little Cayman, and indeed Medium-Density Residential would be unusual and only be appropriate in limited areas.</p> <p>Tourism should be of the existing low-volume type, overwhelmingly stay-over tourism rather than e.g. cruise ship tourism, given the clear evidence that stay-over tourism supports and is supported by environmentally unique and sensitive areas. Tourism should also be 'quiet' and nature orientated, highlighting the pristine reef environment, unique wildlife such as the Sister Islands Rock Iguana, abundant bird-watching, and clear views of the Milky Way in the night skies, and discouraging jet-skis for example so that the marine life is not disturbed (as supported by evidence from the CCMi Quiet Oceans Project), and snorkelers are not injured (as has happened on Grand). Initiatives such as UNESCO World Heritage status and Dark Sky designations should be encouraged, and limits on total footfall of visitors and residents should be considered. All of these tourism efforts would keep Little Cayman the unique biodiverse site that it is, unparalleled in the Cayman Islands, the Caribbean, and the world.</p> <p>As stated in Appendix 2 of the 1997 Development Plan: 'Special care must be taken to avoid indiscriminate opening up of [Little Cayman] if prime assets are not to be lost'.</p>	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones are appropriate in each Area.	
WR15	3-358				
	3-359	3.3 RESIDENTIAL ZONES	"The CPA may permit other compatible uses, such as parks, schools, community buildings, churches, and utility facilities, on a case-by-case basis; provided that they are not the primary use of the site ..." What is the definition of "site" in this instance? It will likely be assumed that site is a singular parcel. Is this requiring mixed-use with a residential component for any proposed non-residential use within a Residential zone? This seems to imply that single-family homes may no longer be converted to pre-schools; proposed churches would require a residential component.	Noted and it is recommended to amend this section accordingly.	Amend section 3.1 as follows: " The <u>In Grand Cayman the</u> 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. <u>In the Sister Islands the Development Control Board (DCB) will continue to be guided by the 1997 Development Plan, with Appendix 1 for the Brac and Appendix 2 for Little Cayman until Area Plans are confirmed.</u> This section sets out the purpose and key considerations for each Planning Zone. The Planning Zones identified in this Planning Statement will be applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands and the Board will determine <u>determination of</u> which zones may be appropriate, and how they will be applied, <u>will occur</u> through the preparation of Area Plans."
	3-360		Retail sales may be permitted in any residential zone where they do not cause a negative impact on residences - Current	Noted	
	3-361		Is ER envisioned to replace current Ag/Res zones in areas not suitable for agriculture?	This will be determined in each Area Plan. As noted in section 3.2 of the draft Planning Statement, the AG zoning could also apply to land in its natural undeveloped state, even if i doesn't have agricultural suitability, because of its correlation contribution to water and soil quality and rustic ambiance.	
	3-362		How will SFR zone be different from Estate Residential? Lot size only? What will the consequences of having two residential zones that do not allow duplexes? This appears to be an obstacle for affordable and generational housing. There are frequent applications where attached, secondary units are requested for older children, aging parents, or maid's quarters. These are often classified as duplexes, which would therefore not be allowed in this zone. The SFR zone might be better suited to allow a secondary unit within certain criteria. Could creating an Accessory Dwelling Unit policy be a compromise?	There are significant differences between ER and SFR zones. The ER zones are proposed for outside of urban areas and will permit small agricultural uses. SFR zones are proposed for periphery of urban areas and in locations where the infrastructure does not support increased density (i.e. additional units which generate traffic and wastewater issues). SFR zoning will only be applied to appropriate neighbourhoods, and these will be determined with the full input of residents and landowners during Area Plan consultation. There will be an opportunity within each Area Plan to determine appropriate densities, setbacks, height restrictions etc for each of the Residential zones.	NOTE: CPA to consider approach to multi-generational homes in ER zones.
	3-363		MDR - multifamily by right; houses & duplexes must pass suitability test - Support.	Noted	
	3-364		HDR - multifamily by right. Houses and duplexes only approved in exceptional circumstances - Support.	Noted	
	3-365	3.4 COMMERCIAL ZONES	GC seems to conflict with 3.4.1.		Amend section 3.4 as follows:
	3-366		"Permit a mix of commercial and residential uses within a single structure." Is this too restrictive? Will Reg. 13(10) remain?	<p>Noted. An amendment is proposed for section 3.4(1) to state that in all commercial zones developments may include a mix of commercial and associated non-commercial uses on a single site.</p> <p>The reference in 3.4.3 'The primary use should remain commercial within GC zones is consistent with 13(8) of the Development and Planning Regulations. It is anticipated that Reg. 13(10) will remain, and therefore allow more flexibility in appropriate situations and locations.</p>	<p>Commercial Zones The policy in respect of proposals for development in Commercial Zones will be that: 1. The Authority shall encourage the creation of vibrant and dense commercial centres and may permit developments that include a mix of commercial and associated non-commercial uses <u>(including residential)</u> on a single site <u>in all commercial zones.</u></p> <p>General Commercial (GC) 2. The Authority may permit a mix of commercial and residential uses within a</p>
	3-367		Will hotels need to pass a suitability test or follow set criteria?	There will be an opportunity in each Area Plan for criteria to be set for hotels in GC zones, if deemed necessary.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR16	3-368		“Zone suitable for a mix of commercial and residential uses appropriately assigned as part of an overall development master plan.” How will this work for isolated vacant NC lands in established areas? How will this work in areas with multiple landowners? Will an Area Plan from the Development Master Plan for the NC zone?	Noted. The Area Plans phase will provide the comprehensive zoning review that would determine appropriate locations for Neighbourhood Commercial Zones	
	3-369		How will adequate mitigation measures to reduce pollution (air, noise, runoff) be determined? Suggest incentivizing modern, innovative solutions.	Incentives may be considered as part of regulations but is outside the scope of the Planning Statement .	
	3-370		TIZ - Support the new zone.	Noted	
	3-371	3.6 COMMUNITY ZONES	What is the benefit of creating three institutional type zones? A civic campus can include a multipurpose facility, schools and parks such as what we have in North Side, Olympic Way, and Bodden Town. Could one zone remain and performance standards be established for different uses?	It is important to separate the uses for instances where multipurpose facilities don’t exist. Assigning specific community zoning will allow for greater transparency and clarity for landowners (current/future purchasers).	
	3-372		EDU - Confirm whether this zone is inclusive of private facilities (pre-schools, daycare, private primary and secondary).	Yes, the intention is to include all educational uses and related facilities to include both private and public.	
	3-373	3.7 TOURISM ZONES	It would be beneficial to include photographs of current on-island developments that meet the criteria of the proposed Neighbourhood Tourism and Resort Residential zones	Consideration will be given to creating a guideline document in this regard potentially to assist Area Plan consultations.	
	3-374		3.7.4.d. “Ensure unobstructed public access to beaches and public open spaces, including fire and rescue vehicles.” Will this require PROWs to sea to be wider?	Noted. The Area Plans phase will provide the comprehensive zoning review that would determine appropriate locations for Hotel Tourism Zones. The existing PROW requirements remain in effect until each Area Plan is prepared which will seek to meet this objective.	
	3-375		3.7.4.f. Will criteria be provided in the Area Plans and Regulations?	Any necessary criteria will be determined in each Area Plan depending on local requirements.	
	3-376		3.7.4.j. Is it intended for the adequate recreation amenites to be available to the public as well as hotel guests?	Noted. This section can be amended to clarify that this relates to hotel guests (in order to ensure that hotel developments do not lead to excessive use of public recreation facilities, thereby disadvantaging residents)	Amend section 3.7(4)(j), as follows: "j. Ensure provision of adequate recreation amenities <i>for hotel guests</i> . "
	3-377	3.8 OPEN SPACE ZONES	“Land that is owned by Crown for public uses including established rights of way.” Clarify whether this includes future road parcels.	Yes . This section could be amended to clarify	Amend section 3.8(2), as follows" "2. The Public Open Space Zone includes land already owned by the Crown / Government including playing fields, public beaches, public parks, nature preserves, and established public rights of way , <i>including roads</i> . "
	3-378		Is it intended to convert all existing LPP lands to COS? How will this be managed for new subdivisions? Will a 5% COS set-aside be required for new subdivisions and if so, will these COS parcels will require Parliament approval?	Yes, future LPP as set aside through subdivision would require rezoning to COS. Consideration could be given to streamlining this process.	
	3-379		Clarify if any COS lands can include commercial recreation (private golf courses, private recreation clubs).	Yes, these uses could be considered for COS zones.	
	3-380		Immediate community should be defined – will this be adjacent subdivisions only? How will this impact gated communities?	Noted. The 'immediate' reference is in regard to LPP lands since under the regulations LPPs serve landowners within a subdivision, rather than the general community. This section could be amended to help clarify.	Amend section 3.8(3), as follows: "3. The Community Open Space Zone Includes land privately owned to which the <i>immediate</i> community may have a right to access, including those lands required to be dedicated by subdivision developers (currently known as Land for Public Purpose) , <i>which serve the immediate community</i> . "
	3-381	3.9 COASTAL MANGROVE BUFFER	What are the Coastal Mangrove Buffer policies? Recommend that development within the CMB may only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Any proposal to remove mangroves shall include a minimum mitigation option.	The intention of the policy is to ensure the long term protection of the mangrove buffer in line with regulations. Any necessary mitigation measures could be added to regulations. It is suggested that additional policy can be added to section 3.9.	Amend s.3.9 as follows" " <i>Coastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB)</i> The Authority shall apply the Coastal Mangrove Buffer policies, and any other relevant policies of this Planning Statement, to ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development , <i>except in exceptional circumstances</i> . "
WR17	3-382		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR18	3-383		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR19	3-384		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	3-385		Zoning and Land Use (Section 3) Recommendations: • Introduce clear guidelines and criteria for zoning and land use decisions, emphasizing the protection of green spaces, critical habitats, and cultural heritage sites.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-386		• Include provisions for mixed-use developments that promote walkability, reduce reliance on private vehicles, and enhance community interaction.	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability and promoting alternate forms of transportation as highlighted in Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement. The Area Plan approach will provide a mechanism for the community within in each area to have greater input into the Plan Review process.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR20	3-387		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that zoning policies support diverse economic opportunities and affordable housing options.	<p>The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions within communities along with mixed used developments and vibrant centres (work spaces). Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas. The Planning Statement, the DoP, CPA and DCB are not responsible for conducting affordable housing needs studies but to create a Development Plan that will support these policies when they are brought forward. Kindly note, The Ministry of Planning, Agriculture, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport and Development (PAHITD) launched a comprehensive survey aimed at gathering valuable insights to inform the development of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Section 5.10 of the Planning Statement encourages economic diversification.</p>	
	3-388	3.3 - Single-Family Residential	We object to the following zones: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SFR- this zone will impact Caymanians who may/will need to have more than just a SFR on one lot.	SFR zoning will only be applied to appropriate neighbourhoods, and these will be determined with the full input of residents and landowners during Area Plan consultation	None
	3-389	3.5 - Light Industrial	LI- We support having the LI zone in each district.	Noted	None
	3-390	3.7 - Hotel Tourism	HT- Change name to General Tourism.	Further explanation would be required for the reason for changing the name of this Zone. It is considered that persons are likely used to the name of this Zone and understand the broad nature of it.	None
	3-391	3.8 - Community Open Space	COS- Care must be taken that existing LPP sites that perform a valuable public service are not converted to COS without due public involvement in the decision-making process.	Noted. These instances can be considered in more detail during each Area Plan preparation and consultation	None
	3-392	3.3	Like to have large parcels for home and farming as this is how some families did it previously.	The proposed zones include Agricultural Zones (AG) which would allow for single-family residences on large lots with agricultural activities	None
	3-393		I don't think this topic is going to relate that much to the Sister Islands because it's mentioned very little within the document, so I think it is going to be primarily for Grand Cayman at least currently. They are still saying that we are going to go with being flexible, sustainable, and orderly; and I see those being somewhat conflicting.	The preparation of each Area Plan for the Sister Islands will determine how the various zones are applied and which are most appropriate for those islands	None
	3-394		Now, I agree with Boards, Authorities etc having a certain degree of discretion in their decision. That discretion should be clearly spelled out as to under what conditions you grant a variance. An example was the 1977 Planning Regulations when █████ and I worked on it and were able to have some basic idea as to under what conditions you would grant a discretion included in the amended regulations. For example, if you wanted to do a house but it was too big and encroached on your setbacks, why are you pushing your setbacks? Is it because your land, for example, wasn't rectangular or square? It had some odd angles. If you are trying to build an economical house, it is rectangular, and if you come close to one boundary. the shape of the land might have been a valid reason why you should be granted a variance. So, the Authority has some discretion in those instances.	Noted	None
	3-395		Planning Zones should apply to all three Islands.	The intention is that Planning Zones will be applied during the preparation of Area Plans. This includes each of the Sister Islands	None
	3-396		Just like we talk about things that happened years ago, we may not see it now but you might as well put it in place for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman when that population grows.	Agreed. It is for these reasons that PlanCayman is including the Sister Islands	None
	3-397		The same way we apply certain things in Grand Cayman, whilst each district is different the Sister Islands are different yes, but they should not be excluded from the Planning Law and Regulations. For right now, they basically are. If you live in a subdivision and you got your house, and somebody comes next door and start raising cows. What do you do? There is no zoning. You can't say it's not a suitable land use because of the zoning.	Agreed. It is for these reasons that PlanCayman is including the Sister Islands	None
	3-398		A fascinating comment that was made, all existing Planning Zoning or applications or whatever will be grandfathered in. Someone raised the question that they bought a sub-division and now they have got chickens next door and everything. So, they are saying that when they reassess none of that will change because it will be grandfathered in. They are not going to kick the farm out so, it's almost pointless, right. The whole thing is literally pointless.	New Area Plans and updated zoning will establish agreed rules and zoning requirements for future development	None
	3-399		Planning Zones in all three Islands needed. Agree they should be put in place for Cayman Brac.	Agreed. It is for these reasons that PlanCayman is including the Sister Islands	None
	3-400		That would then bring up the second comment; the comment would be, the zones, if the administrative branch of the Government can't change the zones, that would mean Parliament should be able to change the zones by Regulation; It should put in the Act when they change the zones so that we can be consulted; because right now, where they carry the Gazette somewhere, the average person doesn't see it, they do not know it is happening and all of a sudden your neighbourhood is changing. It's only the people that are really in the know on this is happening. I am going to put XX in this neighbourhood and six or seven of my friends are going to profit handsomely and that's business right.	The Rezone process is an amendment to the Development Plan and involves a 2 month public notification period (advertised in a printed newspaper), prior to Cabinet and Parliament approval.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-401	3.1	You still get notifications if they are following the Law, and you are within a certain distance (you get notifications if they are following the current law. Yes they are following the Law by giving the notification but you bought into an area where I want to put a chicken farm there and then all of a sudden, my neighbours are going to put up a luxury accommodation, and then I am going to get public nuisance and torts against me because I am offending. That is all over the Island and that is what we are all complaining about, yes? So that is what I said at the George Town Meeting that this kind of sounds like a lot of brainwashing because they're saying one thing, oh we have mangroves, wetlands, blah, blah and then doing the opposite, just approving building after building. Well I think that is where the Government is handcuffed a bit, and that means we put back in the elected arm of Government to change the zoning to kind curtail some of the administrative arm of Government because the people who make the Law and the people who enforce the Law, there should be adequate separation of powers, there should be checks and balances, and it seems like there aren't those checks and balances at the moment.	Noted	None
	3-402		Rezoning must go to Parliament, which doesn't necessarily help you.	Noted	None
	3-403		What happens is all changes to the Law/Act, Regulations or the Zoning Map have to be approved by Parliament. What happened, taking the Agriculture/Residential Zone as an example, they initially said one house per acre, then it went up to three houses per acre. That is not changing the zoning – the Zoning is still Agriculture/Residential, so you don't have to go through this public notification process of changing the zoning; you change the Regulations which requires giving X number of days' notice.	The Development and Planning Regulations permit 2 houses per acre on land zoned Ag/Res. However if land in this zone is not situated over a water lens and is not suitable for agriculture, the provisions for LDR zoning may be applied (i.e. Approx. 4 houses for acre). The review of zoning under the Area Plan approach will better understand the agricultural suitability of land and therefore it's most appropriate zoning category	None
	3-404		Maybe that should be buried back in the Act so they would have to debate on the floor of the house, as to what they are doing instead of just changing the Regs.	Unclear what the representation is referring to	None
	3-405		When the Regs are presented to Parliament, each Parliamentarian have the opportunity to speak to, for or against. So that is there but if you are not listening to what is being said in Parliament, it's changed in the Regulation increasing the density on a parcel of land in your vicinity may occur and you wouldn't be aware of it because you were expecting the zoning was going to be or not changed.	Area Plans preparations will provide an opportunity to comprehensively review the application of zoning categories to all parcels. The Area Plan preparation process will include full public consultation.	None
	3-406		One thing I suggested or raised and I wasn't sure how to put it forward but I felt as we have become so much larger now, as a population and with everything that is going on, trying to keep up. Often the comment that comes back from Planning is, well it's on our websites, its in the Minutes, its all on there for you to go and find; but there's no one delivering it to you. So, I felt if each district had its own Planning Officer, that would be a community service person who would monitor what is happening within their own district so that they would be the ones who could raise the alarms. Then you could go in and be informed and figure out what to do; but right now, unless you are going through the Gazettes or listening proceedings of Parliament and that's not going to change, whatever adjustments they do, they are going to say that whatever we have is fair and reasonable right now. So therefore, we need more Community Officers to help with this because it is going to become unmanageable.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	3-407		Can you imagine, even District Councils have not happened yet.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	3-408		Exactly. District Councils are in the Law and it hasn't happened.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	3-409		Planning – no one delivering it to you. You are told, you can find it on our websites. We need our own district planning officer. We should have a Community Planning Officer, so it is more accessible and democratic.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	3-410		For instance, now if I have My house and then I have my Plantation next to my house on an open lot of land. Yeah, a separate parcel. And then, you know, couple of years down the line, I just said, well, I don't want that plantation anymore. I want to give that land to my granddaughter to build a house on, I can't then convert that for her to build her house on. Are you saying that we will have to continue to have that as a plantation? Is that the idea?	The Planning Statement introduces Agricultural Zone, Single Family Residential and Estate Residential zoning, providing various solutions for different circumstances	None
	3-411		You build, and someone comes and put cows next to it. It is said that it would be grandfathered in, so it is almost pointless.	New Area Plans and updated zoning will establish agreed rules and zoning requirements for future development	None
	3-412		I happen to own some acreage in East End, and I was always told that the area that I owned, it is in High Rock Road, and I think after the Quarry, it is zoned Agriculture. On Agriculture Land, you are only allowed, I was told, one dwelling per acre. The whole idea, I was told, is that is to preserve the excellent ground water that there is in East End; (and that is a national treasure that we have, there is a huge water reserve running under East End and the water is exceptional) and to my disbelief about 500ft down from me, there is a sub-division in the Agriculture Zone; a residential sub-division. So, there goes the water table, rather than one dwelling per acre; and not many people that do farming out there even have dwellings on the property. When you leave that now to three or four dwellings on that one acre of property, that is going to substantially change the water quality. I was shocked when I saw the sub-division there. By that time, they were paving the road so somebody must have approved it	The Development and Planning Regulations permit 2 houses per acre on land zoned Ag/Res. However if land in this zone is not situated over a water lens and is not suitable for agriculture, the provisions for LDR zoning may be applied (i.e. Approx. 4 houses for acre). The review of zoning under the Area Plan approach will better understand the agricultural suitability of land and therefore it's most appropriate zoning category	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	3-413	3.2 - AGRICULTURAL ZONE	The Regulations were changed from one house per acre and the correct terminology for that zone is Agriculture/Residential. So you had one house per acre and is now up to three houses per acre. Which is the same as the Low Density/Residential (I could look at it and say I am better off, no, I am not).	The Development and Planning Regulations permit 2 houses per acre on land zoned Ag/Res. However if land in this zone is not situated over a water lens and is not suitable for agriculture, the provisions for LDR zoning may be applied (i.e. Approx. 4 houses for acre). The review of zoning under the Area Plan approach will better understand the agricultural suitability of land and therefore it's most appropriate zoning category	None
	3-414		So how would you know if it is Class 1 or 2 soils?	Department of Agriculture can advise on agricultural suitability	None
	3-415		There is the UWI study from the 1960s. I do not know if that is still being used or if there is a more recent document.	A 1996 study by the UWI identified significant Agriculture Class I and II lands. The National Planning Framework acknowledges that an inventory of prime agricultural land and its current status is required, in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture.	None
	3-416		Since we're on the Agricultural Zone. So, for example, it's telling us what agriculture zone is, what you can, can't do. But what if you say had your land and you wanted to do beekeeping, right, which is part kind of agriculture in a way, but you also needed money, to make money from it, so you would have agritourism, so you have your Beehive and all its things, but you also made it an educational thing with a house with all the signs and people could come taste the honey and then you have sell your little products. Would that be included in your agriculture land so you could have the agritourism part of it? But the only problem is if you start getting that amount of people then you need parking spaces and you need toilets and then you need something else. So that creates a whole other issue.	Section 3.2 of the Planning Statement states that agri-tourism would be permitted in Agricultural Zone	None
	3-417		One thing I picked up on, I mean the number of conflicts all over the document; on the agricultural use, but you flip the page to page 13 in the Estate residential zone, which supposed to be a residential zone, you'll see their accessories using the ER zone includes small agricultural uses including guarded, limited livestock raising, non-commercial stable, limited agricultural production. I mean, the document is just so disorganized. It's flipping back, I don't think it's very well thought out. I think the draftsman when they try to put this together and reconcile with all the other laws are going to be in deep problems. But that's just that just goes to show there are, there's still the overlap between agriculture and resident and that's kind of how the laws in Cayman have come about is, the two of them overlap; and so, there's other laws that are impacting this. So, when they're thinking about the planning law, they may have an implication on this, but then there's other implications on other laws, and they're not consulting on those other laws. They're just sticking to this document and that's a problem.	The introduction of the Estate Residential Zone is an acknowledgement that there is demand in certain locations for large-lot single family residences with accessory 'hobby farm' uses. This is explained in section 3.3	None
	3-418		Another thing that I picked up on, just quickly. The opening paragraph says alternative agricultural opportunities are not determinant of race. So, they want these alternative agricultures to be embraced. Now there are a couple of young men, they were doing this container farming and then OffReg stepped in because they wanted to generate their own power to do the containerized farming. And so, you see right there is an example of off Reg being another authority, another piece of legislation that's impacting on the planning legislation. So, the whole thing doesn't really serve a purpose in that you're consulting us on the planning laws, but the planning laws are just one small piece of this puzzle. And so it's an incomplete document. So that's why it's just that they just need to rethink this whole thing. It was a nice try but didn't quite make it.	Supporting alternative agricultural opportunities in order to utilise lands which may be suitable for agriculture is consistent with the Food and Nutrition Security Policy. Any conflict with Ofreg would be a case-by-case basis, and outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	3-419		It crosses all of these on estate residential, single family residential, low density goes across all of them. And I was just curious and maybe other people are in the audience as well curious. It defines it as periphery urban residential located outside urban zones, urban residential district. So, it speaks about areas but then I can't find anywhere and just only looked over it very quickly and I think on page five they hopefully put a map in here but those terms don't match up. To you, maybe that's probably purposely done, but could you speak on that quickly because I'm confused.	The purpose of the Planning Statement is to define the various zone and overlays. These will be applied to the map during the preparation of Area Plans, in full consultation with the community	None
	3-420		I have an issue that a duplex is prohibited in this zone.	Agricultural Zone is proposed for properties that are in their natural undeveloped state, or are used for agriculture or have potential for agriculture. In general any residential use is restricted to single-family in order to retain land for its intended purpose	None
	3-421		I just wanted to inquire if the overlay zone offers more protection if you have the institutional with a historic overlay as you were saying, like doubling up offers more protection?	As stated in section 4.1, Overlay Zones identify areas with additional considerations and requirements beyond the underlying zoning	None
	3-422		Yes, overlay zones offer another layer of protection.	Noted	None
	3-423		On Grand Cayman, we basically have two water lenses. We have East End, if you go into East End, you see what grows there, you will realise there is very little soil but there is excellent water. The other area of course is Lower Valley, where you have good soil, but the water quality is deteriorating too because of the residential development. People don't want to be far from Town so, they are trying to stay in Prospect, Lower Valley, Savannah area. Coupled with that is again, the whole Zoning because in the same problem that we face here in West Bay where we have run out of space for Commercial Activity, I think that they are not seeing the link between commercial activity and traffic. If they were seeing that link, they would encourage/be dropping planning fees. Zero planning fees to get commercial activity in Bodden Town, North Side and East End, where you have lots of land and you are going to have a growth in population; but if they have to come to George Town for everything then our traffic situation will only get worse.	PlanCayman supports commercial activity and light industrial uses in appropriate locations throughout the Islands to meet market demand. This includes primary commercial centres as well as neighbourhood-scale commercial within district centres. Amendments to fee schedules are outside the scope of the Planning Statement. Commercial activity can be incentivised in appropriate locations through policy and regulations.	None
	3-424		If you drop all the Planning Fees, how do fill that void?	Noted	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-425		You mean the economic? [REDACTED]: Yes. No, you still get that, you are still getting that from all the materials that are going to be required to build those properties out.	Noted	None
	3-426		[REDACTED] You mean if you drop the fees?	Noted	None
	3-427		[REDACTED] Yes, if you drop the fees.	Noted	None
	3-428		The fees will become more productive, and productivity then drives the economy so they would be able to buy more. Say if I am at home rapping on my keyboard, and I am getting more business into Cayman rather than sitting in traffic. Most of the business comes from outside of Cayman; the money comes from outside and comes in. So if you can get more money in, meaning, sitting in traffic less, then you make more money.	Noted	None
	3-429		Response: [REDACTED]: Agreed but how quickly is government going to see those funds when they are doing their annual budget.	Noted	None
	3-430		I think this is one of the problems, Immigration, which like I say is hard to control because we need workers; Immigration and things like Planning Fees and stuff have become a driver in Government' budget and that should not be the case. Just to give you an example, in 2014 when we were talking about the Cruise Pier and South Sound was put on the thing. At that time, NRA told us that the busiest round-about on the Island was Hurley's round-about. There were 38,000 cars per day going through the round-about in 2014. Now, its ten years later. I bet you it is 50 or 60,000 now. Why? They all having to come to Town, all at the same time and when they are leaving, all leaving at the same time.	Noted	None
	3-431		We support this zone.	Noted	None
	3-432		There are numerous ways and means to address traffic; it just needs persons who can make those kinds of decisions to act on it but there are competing interests. When they were applying for Grand Harbour Development (they didn't have any plan for widening the road and then they came back to widen it to four lanes. We recommended at least three lanes in each direction because that is what was going to be needed in the not-too-distant future. What are they doing now? They up to six lanes now. Government only interested in next election cycle.	The Planning Statement supports public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the mixing of uses to create walkable centres, all of which would encourage fewer journeys by car	None
	3-433		That may be, but more roads that lead to the same place is not a solution.	The Planning Statement supports public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the mixing of uses to create walkable centres, all of which would encourage fewer journeys by car	None
	3-434		I agree with that but what I am saying is that our governments over the years, are only interested in the next election cycle. (four years, that's a problem). They don't see much beyond that.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement document	None
	3-435	3.3 - RESIDENTIAL ZONES	One question on fees – estate residential for rich people to get better estate? Is this not for Caymanians to have families living together?	Estate Residential zones are intended to be very low density, typically located outside of urban areas. The approach to multi-generational residences in this zone will be considered by the Authority.	NOTE: CPA to consider approach to multi-generational homes in ER zones.
	3-436		Zoning – some non-conforming presently (but could be conformed later). Sounds like a plan for them and a plan for us.	Zoning for individual parcels will be determined at the Area Plan stage in full consultation with the community	None
	3-437		I do not think so. The reason why I say that is because they say that they want to do these large singlefamily residences typically located on the outside of the Urban area. So if you take the Urban areas, primarily like George Town and our four way - Centennial and couple of other spots, these are your main Urban areas that you are looking at as sort of having these large estate residential lots, sort of on the outskirts of those.	There is a hierarchy of residential zones which determine their density and proximity or distance away from urban / existing residential areas	None
	3-438		What is an Estate? What size? Is there maximum/minimum to make an Estate?	This will be determined within each Area Plan and reflected in Regulations	None
	3-439		That is the next phase where we start to talk about Plans. We start to talk about specific lot sizes for these different types of residential zones.	Noted	None
	3-440		So how would you have a multi-family home development then? I mean there is quite a lot of them that exists. Can you have a large piece of land where within it instead of subdividing they put up dwellings for each family member?	Multifamily is a classification of residential housing type where more than one household lives in it at the same time (such as apartments and condominiums)	None
	3-441		That is possible, even presently. It depends on the land size and how many houses you wish to build.	Noted	None
	3-442		Whether some non-conforming presently but may conform in the future developments will be included cannot be answered at present. Sounds like one plan for us and one plan for them. All: Yes. It sounds like a lot of brainwashing is going on in this thing so whose plan is it? It is not our Plan. This is a Plan that was designed a long time ago and they want to make it seem like we are approving it.	Zoning for individual parcels will be determined at the Area Plan stage in full consultation with the community	None
	3-443	3.4 - COMMERCIAL ZONES	West Bay has run out of space for Commercial Activity.	Zoning for individual parcels will be determined at the Area Plan stage in full consultation with the community	None
	3-444	3.5 - INDUSTRIAL ZONES	Support Light Industrial zone(s) in each district.	Noted	None
	3-445	3.6 - COMMUNITY ZONES	Support Community zone(s) in each district.	Noted	None
	3-446	3.7 - TOURISM ZONES	Support Tourism zone(s) in each district.	Noted	None
	3-447	3.8 - OPEN SPACE ZONES	Support Open Space Zones in each district.	Noted	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR22	3-448	3.2	For example, consider the needs of agriculture. We fully support the statements under Section 3.2 which state, "Given the limited landmass of the Islands, development pressure will likely continue in the limited areas suitable for agriculture if they are not preserved or if alternative agricultural opportunities are not determined and embraced. It is therefore important to ensure that the necessary policies are in place to protect remaining agricultural land, particularly those designated as Class I and II." The Planning Statement provides no clear policies or pathway that will accomplish that objective.	The Planning Statement introduces the Agricultural Zone which seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use. Areas which are less suitable for agriculture will be considered for other zoning categories	None
	3-449		From an environmental perspective, we are extremely concerned about the conversion of good, existing agricultural land to residential development. There are knock-on adverse environmental effects where primary habitat is then cleared to become farming land. Areas all over Cayman which were historically farmed are being lost at an increasing rate and when that land gets built on, and farmers are displaced and new land is cleared which is usually less suitable for farming. That land was left in a natural state because it wasn't that good for farming at the beginning.	The Planning Statement introduces the Agricultural Zone (AG) which seeks to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use. Areas which are less suitable for agriculture will be considered for other zoning categories. Land zoned for (AG) would only permit single family residences on large lots and so are not considered to be for developed for primarily residential use.	None
	3-450		The Planning Statement states, " <i>The Agricultural Zone is proposed for those properties that are - In their natural undeveloped state, - Are primarily used for agricultural purposes, or - Have the potential to be used for agricultural purposes because of soil and terrain characteristics and are located over freshwater lenses</i> " The Planning Statement proposes to zone primary habitat for agriculture, thereby creating a perverse incentive to clear some of our most ecologically significant and biologically diverse habitats.	Ecologically significant and biologically diverse habitats would also likely have 'Natural Resource Preservation Overlay', thereby applying further restrictions and considerations than are in place at present	None
	3-451		The next question is therefore, will the provisions of the proposed Planning Statement protect existing agricultural land from development? The answer is no: - In the Agricultural Zone, single family residences are permitted (on larger lots - which is undefined). - Generally, planning applications for dwelling units on land zoned for other purposes (presumably including agriculture) will be considered on their merits Therefore, conversion of agricultural land to residential development is both a) expressly allowed for single-family homes and b) inferred for other types of residential development by other policies	The appropriate 'larger lot' size will be defined at area plan stage and incorporated into Regulations. The second point is a reference to section 3.3(6) of the Planning Statement, which is considered appropriate since it refers to 'having regard to the effect they may have on the character and efficient usage or potential of the surrounding area'. Therefore, if land is categorised as having agricultural suitability it would not be considered appropriate for dwelling units (beyond those permitted in Agricultural Zone)	
	3-452		The third question is then whether the rules around subdivision of land will assist in preventing the loss of agricultural land. There is a statement to this effect on page 23 of the Planning Statement. "The subdivision of land encompassing important or prime agricultural land (terms which are not defined or mapped) shall not, except in exceptional circumstances, be permitted where it may result in good quality arable land being taken out of product." The Central Planning Authority has always had a large element of discretion to grant exceptions to the rules, and has always used them liberally. The frequency of statements such as "flexible", "case-by-case basis", "may permit", "where appropriate", "in a manner best calculated to" and "by discretion" mean that there will little accomplished in the way of managing impacts from development.	The various zones and overlays set out the rules and restrictions for development, but the Authority is granted discretion in certain instances under the Development and Planning Regulations to ensure that Cayman continues to be a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	None
WR23	3-453		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
	3-454	3.1 Introduction	Excellently written! No further observations.	Noted.	
	3-455	3.2 Agricultural Zone	Really well written! Minor tweak is recommended below to recognise existing / Cabinet approved Food and Security Policy. Amend paragraph 2 to recognised relevant national policies approved by the Cabinet of the Cayman Islands Government as follows – ‘Subject to the Development and Planning Act and Regulations, the Authority shall support agricultural zoning policies, other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, and other pertinent Cabinet approved national policies in order to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural1 use.’ Bold font to highlight part recommended for amendment.	Acknowledged	Amend second paragraph in section 3.2 to state, "Subject to the Development and Planning Act and Regulations, the Authority shall support agricultural zoning policies, other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, and other pertinent Cabinet approved national policies to ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use".
	3-456	3.3 Residential Zones	Really well written first 2 paragraphs and bullet points! Considering the pace of development in a small jurisdiction (especially Grand Cayman), minor “catch all” amendments are recommended re lot size (introducing both minimum and maximum, in effect a range), building height / number of storeys and setbacks. Considering rapid development on limited space on Grand Cayman, add a sentence at the end of the 2nd paragraph as follows – The allowable minimum and maximum lot size range, building height / number of storey and setbacks shall be informed by limited space in a rapid development reality on Grand Cayman.	Acknowledged	Amend section 3.3 as follows: "There are five proposed residential zones that allow for single-family, duplex, and multi-family residences at respectively increasing densities. Typically higher density residential zones will be more suitable for locations better served by infrastructure and transportation. Minimum lot sizes decrease as the permitted

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR24	3-457		<p>To take advantage of the relationship between higher residential density and positively stimulating the market for public transportation, would recommend explicitly stating so.</p> <p>Add a sentence before the 1st bullet point as follows – ‘Considering the well-known relationship between higher residential zones stimulating the market for public transportation, generally higher residential zones shall be positioned near or at existing and proposed major road corridors.’</p>		<p>densities increase The allowable lot sizes, building heights and setbacks shall vary in each residential zone, to make efficient use of land, and in each Area Plan based on local constraints and considerations."</p>
	3-458	3.4 Commercial Zones	<p>Central George Town’s General Commercial zone should be vibrant (a hub of activity) day and night. Regrettably this isn’t so partly because the amount of allowable residential use in multistorey commercial buildings is inadequate. Toward ensuring appropriate ratio of commercial to residential, revisit existing use ratio toward a balance that stimulates vibrancy, supporting Central George Town businesses, particularly at night.</p> <p>Delete and replace the 1st bullet point as follows – ‘General Commercial (GC) zone, is suitable for the higher density and intensity commercial developments (while accommodating appropriate mix of residential use in multistorey buildings) typically found in urban core areas. These zones maximize site coverage and building height allowances;’</p>	Noted. The mix of commercial and residential uses in GC zones is acknowledged in the policy section of 3.4	
	3-459	3.5 Industrial Zones and 3.6 Community Zones	Really well written! No further observations.	Noted.	
	3-460	3.7 Tourism Zones	<p>Really well written! Minor tweak recommended below.</p> <p>Due to local connotation of “Cayman” to mean Grand Cayman, would suggest amending the 1st line of paragraph one as follows – ‘Tourism is one of the pillars of the Cayman Islands’ economy.’ Bold font only to illustrate recommended amendment.</p>	Acknowledged	Amend 1st paragraph in section 3.7 to state, "Tourism is one of the pillars of the Cayman Islands’ economy".
	3-461	3.8 Open Space Zones	1st and 2nd paragraphs really well written! No further observations on these.	Noted.	
	3-462		<p>While the 3rd paragraph rightly recognises that in certain situations public access may be restricted, public sensitivity on this subject requires tweaking of this paragraph to recognise the importance of beach access. While this is covered at item 11 of ‘5.7 NATURAL RESOURCES AND COASTLINE’ at page 27, due to sensitivity, it should be stated here as well. See below recommendation in this regard.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3 (add a sentence at the end) to read as follows - ‘The Authority recognises that, in certain situations, public access to Open Spaces (both ‘Public’ and ‘Community’ Open Spaces) may be restricted by management and/or conservation arrangements. For clarity, this does not apply to access to beaches and related matters as enshrined in legislation.’</p>	Noted. This section can be amended accordingly.	Amend section 3.8, as follows: "The Authority recognises that, in certain situations, public access to Open Spaces (both ‘Public’ and ‘Community’ Open Spaces) may be restricted by management and/or conservation arrangements. This does not apply to access to beaches and related matters as enshrined in legislation. "
	3-463	3.9 Coastal Mangrove Buffer	Really well written! No further observations.	Noted.	
	3-464		Will the keeping of livestock be restricted to Agricultural Zones, and Estate Residential Zones?	In terms of residential zones, it is anticipated that livestock would be restricted to AG and ER zones.	
	3-465		What about small operations, like a Petting-zoo?	This would be determined on a case-by-case basis depending on whether the project has a tourism and/or commercial function that makes it suitable for that zone.	
	3-466		Currently, residential areas appear to be a free-for all, where large commercial vehicles (eg. Tour/Public-transport buses, Moving-trucks), and heavy industrial equipment are kept. Shipping containers are kept, ad infinitum. Mobile car-washes operate, on vacant lots. Mobile mechanics keep a collection of vehicles which have fallen into disrepair (or, are frankly derelict). The enjoyment of one’s residential home/property is constantly under threat. I believe that this area needs to be very carefully considered, and closely regulated by governmental agencies, working together (Planning, T&B Licensing, WORC, DEH etc)	Noted. Section 3.3.1 states that the primary land use in Residential Zones shall be residential. Section 3.3.5 of the Planning Statement also states, "Notwithstanding all other policies of this Planning Statement, no use of land in a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odours, conditions or noise, or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to surrounding residents".	
	3-467		The Authority may permit single-family residences only in SFR zones. Duplexes and multifamily residences are prohibited in these zones’ - Some consideration should also be given to regulating the use of singe-family homes/detached houses, both in this zone, and in the Low-Density Residential Zone (LDR). It is an increasingly common practice that single-family homes are tenanted, with multiple cars parked along the road. Not only is this an eye-sore; it is a hazard, as it may restrict the passage of emergency vehicles.	Noted, Development and Planning Regulations can determine number of units and bedroom density on a property. The tenancy arrangements of a property and vehicle ownership of residents is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR25	3-468		The Authority may permit retail and business type developments that service the local community within NC zones' - Why has 'a mix of commercial and residential uses within a single structure' not been considered for the neighbourhood commercial zone?	Section 3.4(1) states that for all commercial zones developments may include a mix of commercial and associated non-commercial uses on a single site. For clarity, this can be added to the NC section.	Amend section 3.4 as follows: Commercial Zones The policy in respect of proposals for development in Commercial Zones will be that: 1. The Authority shall encourage the creation of vibrant and dense commercial centres and may permit developments that include a mix of commercial and associated non-commercial uses (<u>including residential</u>) on a single site <u>in all commercial zones</u> . General Commercial (GC) 2. The Authority may permit a mix of commercial and residential uses within a single structure in GC zones.
	3-469		'Industrial development should be confined to the areas zoned for that purpose. However, Light Industrial uses serving the needs of local communities may be permitted within a residential zone...' - As with home-occupied businesses and retail sales in residential zones, this gives me cause for concern. Another area that should be very carefully considered, and closely regulated.	These policies gives flexibility to not only to the CPA but the people of the Cayman Islands whose needs are being considered. The Authority will consider such applications on a case by case basis after due notification and assessment of the case being made.	
	3-470		Community facilities include... childcare, education..' - In my opinion, childcare facilities, such as Nurseries and Preschools should be close to where families live, thereby meeting the needs of the residential communities. Placing such facilities in 'community zones' will unnecessarily increase congestion, in already congested areas, at already busy times. Residential zones are better-suited to childcare facilities than retail sales and industrial uses.	Nurseries and preschools may be permitted in residential zones (as outlined in section 3.3(2); 'other compatible uses). Whilst childcare also would be permitted in Community Zones, it's acknowledged that the reference in section 3.6 is overly specific and can be removed.	Amend section 3.6 as follows: "Community facilities include, but are not limited to, childcare , education, adult learning and training, healthcare, police stations, libraries, community halls and places of worship. Facilities may be indoor or outdoor."
	3-471		Neighbourhood Tourism zones shall allow for small-scale hotels and resorts, condominiums and supporting commercial uses and apartments'	Noted.	
	3-472		Some of what is described for Resort Residential zones sounds more suitable for Neighbourhood Tourism zones, and vice versa. I believe that residents would prefer to see cottages and detached/semi-detached houses, small B&Bs/Guest Houses, rather than 'small-scale hotels and resorts, condominiums and supporting commercial uses and apartments', in their neighbourhoods. As I recall, there was much opposition to the Mandarin Oriental development, in Beach Bay, though this was not 'small-scale'.	The aim of the Resort Residential is to provide a transition in character from Hotel Tourism to adjacent residential zones. Neighbourhood Tourism is aimed more at smaller scale less dense tourism related developments. The intention is still to have transitional zoning (Resort Residential) where necessary between the Neighbourhood Tourism and residential zones. Consideration will be given to creating a guideline document explaining the hierarchy of the Tourism Zones potentially to assist Area Plan consultations.	
	3-473		The Authority shall preserve land for public enjoyment, and protect them from non-recreational development. - Regarding public beaches, stacks of beach chairs/loungers should not be left on our public beaches, by those who rent them to cruise-ship visitors. They are most unsightly, and reduce residents' enjoyment of the beaches, at other times.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
WR26	3-474		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR27	3-475		<p>In line with practices in other jurisdictions seeking to guide specific development activities, optimize supportive infrastructure planning and investments, and aligning to aspects of the 2024-2045 National Energy Policy, it may be worth considering the description and designation of a Renewable Energy Zone, in addition to the eight (8) already proposed. Land suitable to this zoning is generally informed through renewable resource adequacy studies, land characterization reports, and similar suitability evaluations (associated neighboring land-use or zoning, predicted or demonstrated development interest, etc.). Land in Renewable Energy Zones need not be mutually exclusive of other zoning designations for the purposes of development planning.</p> <p>The use of designated Renewable Energy Zones is common practice in many jurisdictions to reduce uncertainties for potential siting of renewable energy projects and support the efficient and cost-effective planning of requisite utility interconnection infrastructure (e.g. transmission network circuits). Designating Renewable Energy Zones can reduce the costs of renewable energy infrastructure and amplify their community benefits by creating “clusters” for renewable energy projects and approaching infrastructure planning from a more holistic perspective, rather than incrementally or in an uncoordinated manner. Renewable Energy Zones further support environmental conservation by allowing for earlier stage environmental impact assessment, planning and community engagement for renewable energy project development and integration to optimize benefits and minimize potential land-use impacts. This zoning also reduces uncertainty for renewable energy project siting or potential development on less suitable land parcels, preserving such land for alternative uses.</p>	<p>Noted and thank you for the suggestion. More research and data would be required to determine the feasibility and demand for introducing such a zone in Cayman. It may be more appropriate as an Overlay, if determined to be applicable to Cayman, and could be considered in future Development Plan reviews.</p>	None
	3-476	3.2	<p>The definition to designate properties in the Agricultural Zone appears to be extraordinarily broad. The current criteria are to designate as Agricultural Zone all properties that are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Are in their natural undeveloped state;2. Are primarily used for agricultural purposes; or3. Have the potential to be used for agricultural purposes because of soil and terrain characteristics and are located over freshwater lenses. <p>In effect, the first criterion essentially designates all undeveloped land as Agricultural Zone, which appears inappropriate, particularly where the specific location of the property or the property site characteristics are unsuitable to agricultural activities</p> <p>This could be corrected rather readily through a revision to the criteria to specify only a subset of undeveloped property, plus property that has already been primarily used for agricultural purposes. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Are in their natural developed state, and2. Have the potential to be used for agricultural purposes because of soil and terrain characteristics and are located over freshwater lenses; or3. Are primarily used for agricultural purposes. <p>This revision would allow the latter set of criteria to limit the definition of Criterion 1 to only that subset of land that also meets Criterion 2, thereby avoiding designating land unsuitable for agricultural purposes as Agricultural Zone. Criterion 3 would continue to designate land primarily used for agricultural purposes as Agricultural Zone.</p>	<p>The list of possible property types that could be zoned AG does not mean that 'all' properties that are undeveloped would have this zoning. The wording in the Planning Statement does not state 'all'. Some undeveloped parcels may be suitable for residential uses and would be considered for that zoning. The list in section 3.2 is stating that properties zoned AG will have 1 of the 3 listed criteria (i.e. will either be undeveloped, or currently used for agriculture, or have potential to be used for agriculture).</p> <p>Also, it may be appropriate for some land in natural undeveloped state, even if i doesn't have agricultural suitability, to be zoned AG because of its correlation contribution to water and soil quality and rustic ambiance</p>	None
	3-477	3.2	<p>In respect to Agricultural Zone policies, there may be value in considering the allowance of development that does not otherwise diminish the long-term viability of agricultural land for agricultural use. The proposed policy would:</p> <p>“Restrict development on AG zoned land to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single family residences on larger lots;• Agricultural related buildings and facilities; and• Other uses that are accessory to the primary agricultural use (such as agricultural product processing, agri-tourism and the vending of agricultural merchandise produced on-site).”<p>It may be beneficial to consider the inclusion of an additional allowed use-case expanding limited development opportunities that would not inhibit the potential for future agricultural use or future co-located agricultural use. Examples of these types of development might include electricity or telecommunications infrastructure, such as solar PV facilities (whether configured to primarily serve as solar PV generation or as an agri-voltaic co-use approach), wind turbines, cellular or radio towers, etc. These developments either have relatively small physical footprints (wind turbines and cellular/radio towers) or will otherwise not diminish the agricultural quality and potential of the land at end of life (solar PV facilities).</p><p>The proposed policy could be amended to:</p><p>“Restrict development on AG zoned land to:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single family residences on larger lots;• Agricultural related buildings and facilities; and• Other uses that are accessory to the primary agricultural use (such as agricultural product processing, agri-tourism and the vending of agricultural merchandise produced on-site); or• Other development uses that that will not inhibit the co-development of ongoing or future agricultural activities or that will not diminish the agricultural value and potential of the associated land for agricultural purposes at the end of useful life for the proposed development use.”	<p>Noted. Agreed, wording can be amended in section 3.2(2) to allow for uses which do not inhibit ongoing or future agricultural activities.</p> <p>Solar farms have previously been considered Commercial Use and so wording of 3.2(3) can be amended to ensure that these uses are not prohibited</p>	<p>Amend section 3.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>Agricultural Zone (AG)</u> <i>The Authority shall apply the Agricultural Zoning (AG) policies, and other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, to</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Ensure that prime agricultural land remains viable for agricultural use.</i>2. <i>Restrict commercial uses in the AG zone to those which are accessory and directly related to the primary agricultural use of the site</i>3. <i>Restrict development on AG zoned land to:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Single family residences on larger lots;</i>• <i>Agricultural related buildings and facilities; and</i>• <i>Other uses that are accessory to the primary agricultural use (such as agricultural product processing, agri-tourism and the vending of agricultural merchandise produced on-site). ; and</i> <p>• <i>Notwithstanding paragraph (2), other uses that will not inhibit ongoing or future agricultural activities or diminish the agricultural value and potential of the land for agricultural purposes at the end of the useful life of the proposed development use.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. <i>Prohibit aggregate extraction activities on prime agricultural land.</i>5. <i>Promote and support alternative agriculture technologies. Subject to other considerations, such technologies may also be permitted in Industrial and Commercial zones.</i>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-478	3.3	The development of renewable energy generation facilities may not be adequately facilitated by the general Residential Zone policy, which states in part that, “the Authority may permit other compatible uses, such as... utility facilities, on a case by case basis, provided that they are not the primary use of the site and do not cause a significant negative impact on surrounding residences from noise, traffic and other issues” (emphasis added). The restriction that such use cases may not be the primary use of the site could be inordinately restrictive; in a scenario where a particular site was suitable for a renewable energy facility serving, amongst others, the surrounding residences, but would utilize the totality of the site, this policy would appear to disallow that development, though in principle it would not be the primary use of the general area in which the specific site is located and may be beneficial and desirable to the surrounding residences and area. Consideration should be given to the specific language of the Residential Zone policy so as not to preclude development of desirable projects (parks, schools, churches, renewable energy facilities) on land sites of a size insufficient to both provide a primary residential purpose and the ancillary use.	Noted and agreed. There was an error in drafting and an amendment is proposed to allow for 'other compatible uses' in Residential Zones provided that they do not cause significant negative impact and that the primary use of the zone (not the site) is maintained. This ensures that the wider zone maintains its use and character, but other compatible uses are permitted to occupy the entirety of a single parcel.	In 3.3.2 - Re-word sentence to read " <i>The Authority may permit other compatible uses, such as parks, schools, community buildings, churches, and utility facilities, on a case by case basis, provided that they are not the primary use of the site and do not cause a significant negative impact on surrounding residences from noise, traffic and other issues <u>and that the primary use of the zone is maintained</u>.</i> "
	3-479	3.5	With respect to the provision in the Industrial Zone policy allowing for limited Light Industrial uses within Residential Zones, and the definition of the Light Industrial Zone, clarification should be provided as to whether renewable energy facilities are to be classified as Light Industrial use. Under the current Planning and Development Regulations, “power generation” is included as a Heavy Industrial use; however, this attribution seems to be intended toward power generation from fuel sources. Due to changes in generation technology, and in consideration of related power generation development activities aligned to the National Energy Policy targets, it would likely be worthwhile to designate power generation uses with greater specificity to appropriately attribute to Light or Heavy Industrial uses. Alternatively, this may be resolved through the creation of a Renewable Energy Zone.	Solar farms have previously been considered Commercial Use and so wording of 3.2(3) can be amended to ensure that these uses are not prohibited, see above. Agreed that a definition could be added to the Regulations to add clarity to this issue.	
	3-480		Question: What are the implications for landowners whose zoning will change or new overlays are applied? Where will the legislation regarding Rezoning appear? Recommend this information/detail be added to this section	Section 3.1 explains that The 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions (see Schedule 2) will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. New zoning and overlays will affect future development on a given parcel of land.	None
	3-481		General - It is not clear how zones will be determined and what the criteria will be for rezoning applications. Is this covered by the Development and Planning Act and Regulations? Recommend adding a section describing the direction for rezoning.	The process for rezoning is explained in section 1.4 of the draft planning Statement: As each Area Plan is prepared, the boundaries for Planning Zones and Overlay Zones for that area will be determined and then, once approved, it will create a new section in the overall Zoning Map for the Cayman Islands. Each Area Plan will state how the Authority would apply the zoning considerations within that area (i.e. the maximum building height for a Neighbourhood Commercial zone may vary between different Areas). Criteria for determining zoning will be based on data presented during each Area Plan drafting process (this will include, but not be limited to, land vacancy rate by existing zone, planning project approval data for each Area, information gathered from other government department regarding natural resources, heritage assets and hazard risk...and so on), and input from the public on how they wish to see their community develop over time. Agree that information can be added to section 1.4 to help explain this.	Insert additional text in section 1.4, as follows: <i>"The process for applying Planning Zones and Overlays Zones during Area Plan preparation will involve a thorough review of available data and information (from a range of sources) along with full public consultation with the public, landowners and all stakeholders."</i>
	3-482	3.1 - INTRODUCTION	Section 3.1 INTRODUCTION - The second paragraph states “..., and other relevant planning policies of the Planning Statement,...” and is confusing in respect of subsection a., which states: “Is consistent with the policies of the Planning Statement....” Recommend rewording this to ensure it makes sense.	This wording is taken from the 1997 Planning Statement document and is considered to be appropriate	None
	3-483	3.2 - AGRICULTURAL ZONE	3.2 Agricultural Zone Main Text: Top priority for properties zoned AG should be that they meet the Class I and II designations, not that they “Are in their natural undeveloped state”. Recommend changing paragraph 1 to read “1. They meet the Class I and Class II designations.	Noted. Land in its natural undeveloped state is considered appropriate for this zoning category because, even if i doesn't have agricultural suitability, it would have corresponding contribution to water and soil quality and rustic ambiance. Noted regarding the order, which can be amended	Amend section 3.2 as follows: <i>"The Agricultural Zone (AG) is proposed for those properties that:</i> 1. Are in their natural undeveloped state; 2. 1. Are primarily used for agricultural purposes; or 3. 2. Have the potential to be used for agricultural purposes because of soil and terrain characteristics and are located over freshwater lenses ;or <i>3. Are in their natural undeveloped state."</i>
	3-484		Zone Description: Paragraph 1 - How is “prime Agricultural Land” defined? Recommend this criterion be outlined to assist in determining where these areas are or where they are referenced.	The definition and identification of land suitable for agriculture would need to be in consultation with Department of Agriculture as part of Area Plan preparation	None
	3-485		Paragraph 2 - “Single family residences on larger lots” What is the definition of a larger lot? Recommend this criterion be outlined to assist in determining what this means or where it is referenced.	This definition of larger lot size is a matter for Area Plans and Regulations	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-486	3.2 - AGRICULTURAL ZONE	Paragraph 5 - Planning Statement policies should also encourage backyard farming and community gardens (including rooftop gardens in higher density areas/apartment buildings/townhouses), climate-resilient production techniques not reliant on virgin land, freshwater lenses or good quality soils, e.g. hydroponics and indoor flex farms units currently in use by schools across the Cayman Islands and other DoA partners. Policies should also aim to avoid conflicts and reduce common nuisance complaints (noise, odour, burning) associated with agricultural activities in residential areas. Recommend adding more detail to this paragraph including aligning it with the Food and Nutrition Security Policy. <u>Recommend changing first sentence in paragraph 5 to ‘Promote and support alternative agriculture technologies, such as agrophotovoltaics.’</u>	The current wording ('alternative agriculture technologies') is sufficiently broad to encompass any relevant technologies that come forward. Reference to specifics may date the Planning Statement document. Section 3.3 of the Planning Statement introduces 'Estate Residential' Zones to allow for small agricultural uses in Residential areas, to therefore reduce the conflicts of these uses in Low Density Residential areas.	None
	3-487		<u>In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.4.8 Water & Wastewater Sector Strategy: Promote initiatives designed to protect ground water resources and achieve environmentally friendly and efficient collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater.</u>	This is reflected in section 5.5 (Wastewater) of the Planning Statement	None
	3-488	3.3 - RESIDENTIAL ZONES	3.3 Residential Zones <u>In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.1.1 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Promote the inclusion of renewable energy and energy storage solutions in new and existing structures, including those of critical facilities to promote energy resiliency. - 3.4.6 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage the development of public transportation as a viable alternative to private transportation. - 3.4.8 Water & Wastewater Sector Strategy: Promote initiatives designed to protect ground water resources and achieve environmentally friendly and efficient collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater.</u>	These issues are reflected in the relevant parts of section 5 of the Planning Statement (Design, Circulation and Infrastructure)	None
	3-489		Zone Description Recommend adding a section regarding spaces for walking and cycling and adding a minimum percentage.	This is reflected in section 5.9 of the Planning Statement	None
	3-490		General - Assumption that “safe” housing includes climate-resilient design and siting outside of high-risk hazard areas, at adequate ground floor elevation, etc. Recommend to include such language here to reflect concern for “the ongoing and predicted impacts of climate change” on “every individual, organisation, and sector in the Cayman Islands” expressed in Section 2.7.	This would be overly prescriptive, and such issues are reflected in other sections of the Planning Statement (Sensitive Coastline Overlay, Design) and within Regulations (in terms of ground floor elevation)	None
	3-491		Paragraph 4. Retail sales may only be permitted in residential zones where they do not cause a negative impact on surrounding residences. Should retail sales be permitted in residential zones or just permitted in the Neighbourhood Commercial Zone (MC). Recommend removing this paragraph or clarifying “causing negative impact”.	Retail sales which do not cause a negative impact on surrounding residences (i.e. through noise, traffic etc) can support mixed-use communities, preventing the need to travel for certain services	None
	3-492		LDR - Paragraph 10 Low-Density Residential Zone (LDR) states "The Authority may permit detached houses, duplexes and, in suitable locations, multifamily residences (such as apartment buildings and townhouses) an LDR zone." Given this is meant to be a low-density zone, our recommendation is to not allow apartment buildings and townhouses at all. This is already included in both medium and high-density zoning. Recommend changing the sentence to read: "The Authority may permit detached houses, and duplexes in LDR zone."	The suggested amendment would be overly restrictive. Densities can be set for each of the Residential Zones through Area Plans and Regulation to maintain a hierarchy of density	None
	3-493		MDR & HDR In medium and/or high-density zones especially, encourage the concept of live-work-play such that resources are not spent on costly transportation infrastructure and a sense of community is created through purpose-built design. Walkable/Cyclable communities reduce traffic congestion, air pollution, increase exercise and wellbeing, and potentially eliminate the need for vehicle ownership, freeing much-needed income for homeownership. Acknowledge General & Neighbourhood Commercial Zones here? Affordable housing is not addressed here – how will “a range of housing types to meet the needs of all residents within mixed and sustainable communities” mentioned in Section 2.5 be provided otherwise? Recommend the Authority actively engage with the Affordable Housing Policy to provide guidance.	Noted. It is anticipated that MDR and HDR zones will be located adjacent to commercial areas to support walkable / cyclable communities. Also, section 3.3 indicates that other compatible uses will be permitted in residential zones, where appropriate. The Authority is awaiting the recommendations of the Affordable Housing and will incorporate through Regulations where possible.	None
	3-494		HDR - Paragraph 12 High-Density Residential Zone (HDR). The only difference between this and MDR is the words exceptional circumstances for detached houses. This seems too similar to MDR “in appropriate locations”. Recommend removing this part to read “The Authority may permit multifamily residences (such as apartment buildings and townhouses) in HDR zones.”	The current wording is considered appropriate. The hierarchy indicates that detached houses and duplexes are generally inappropriate for HDR zones, but provides flexibility for 'exceptional circumstances'	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	3-495		Page 14 - 3.4. General Commercial Zone. In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.11 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Promote the inclusion of renewable energy and energy storage solutions in new and existing structures, including those of critical facilities to promote energy resiliency. - 3.4.3 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage bicycles and e-bikes as an alternative mode of transportation and work with the Ministries responsible for transportation and land use planning to develop strategies to increase bicycle safety. - 3.4.4 Transportation Sector Strategy: Optimize traffic efficiency and address current bottlenecks. - 3.4.5 Transportation Sector Strategy: Promote measures designed to facilitate efficient utilization of and reduce demand for available parking space. - 3.4.6 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage the development of public transportation as a viable alternative to private transportation.	Noted. These issues are reflected in section 5 of the Planning Statement	None
	3-496	3.4 - COMMERCIAL ZONES	GC - Paragraph 4 – The Authority may permit hotels in GC Zones: Recommend not to permit any hotels in the General Commercial Zone, given that hotel types are adequately accounted for in section 3.7 (e.g., Hotel/Tourism Zone, the Neighborhood Tourism Zone, Resort Residential Tourism Zone).	Hotels are considered to be appropriate uses for GC zones and should not be excluded	None
	3-497	3.5 - INDUSTRIAL ZONES	Page 15 - 3.5. Industrial Zones In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.3 Electricity Sector Strategy: Promote the utilization of brownfield sites such as marl-pits in the build-out of renewable energy facilities. - 3.3.10 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Rank resources to determine areas of land, sea, or air suitable for future electricity production and storage, giving preference to resources that provide net benefits to greenhouse gas emissions and minimize negative environmental impacts. - 3.3.12 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Facilitate the enhanced security of the electrical distribution network.	Noted regarding the use of brownfield sites, not only for renewable energy facilities, but also in the identification of any new industrial zoning. Recommend inserting additional text to encourage the use of brownfield sites for future industrial zoning.	Amend section 3.5(4), as follows: "4. The Authority will ensure that industrial property has minimal impact on adjacent non-industrial uses and natural resources from noise, air pollution and other environmental issues <u>and will encourage the use of brownfield sites for future additional industrial zoned property, where possible.</u> "
	3-498		General - There is no mention of pollution controls. Recommend adding a section that includes reference to adequate controls for air, light, noise, etc. pollution. As an example, Home Gas currently flares off gas along a busy road along where several schools and residences are located. General – Recommend adding guidance for planned relocation of industrial activities that no longer are suitable for the surrounding area.	Section 3.5(4) indicates that the Authority will ensure that industrial property has minimal impact on adjacent non-industrial uses and natural resources from noise, air pollution and other environmental issues. Section 5.5 makes reference to ensuring that fuel storage areas and surrounding land uses are compatible. Section 5.7 also makes reference to the need to prevent land-based pollution. Each Area Plan will consider the appropriate location for future industrial uses. Relocation of existing activities would be outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	None
	3-499		Industrial Zone Description: Paragraph 1 – This sentence states that “However, Light Industrial uses serving the needs of local communities may be permitted within a residential zone, subject to the policies in section 3.3”. However, there is no mention of “Light Industrial” in section 3.3. Recommend removing this sentence and not permitting light industry in residential zones given the sensitivity of residential living to industry. It is an inappropriate mix and will likely create issues for quality of life.	The reference 'subject to the policies in section 3.3' is an indication that all policies in the Residential Zones section of the document (section 3.3) should be followed. This relates to issues such as '5...no use of land in a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious...etc'. If light industrial uses can meet all of these criteria then it is considered that they might be appropriate as compatible uses in residential areas and they could help contribute to mixed use neighbourhoods, local employment and reducing the need to travel etc.	None
	3-500		Paragraph 4 - In addition to minimal impact on natural resources, an underlying principle of these zones should be to utilise brownfields wherever possible. Absence of a quarry zone (guidance provided by CH2MHill study) or mention of aggregate extraction activities in HI Zone is peculiar. Recommend adding or rewording this to ensure brownfield sites are utilized as a priority. Also recommend adding a new quarry Zone.	See above, recommended inclusion of brownfield site utilisation. The CPA Aggregate Policy seeks to determine environmental constraints and includes a 'Quarry Siting Map'. This identification of quarry exclusion areas and sensitive areas, is considered more appropriate than identifying zones for new quarries, particularly as the aggregate policy also seeks to plan for a long-term importation strategy.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-501	3.6 - COMMUNITY ZONES	(Pg. 16) 3.6. Community Zones. In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.1.1 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Promote the inclusion of renewable energy and energy storage solutions in new and existing structures, including those of critical facilities to promote energy resiliency. - 3.4.3 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage bicycles and e-bikes as an alternative mode of transportation and work with the Ministries responsible for transportation and land use planning to develop strategies to increase bicycle safety. - 3.4.4 Transportation Sector Strategy: Optimize traffic efficiency and address current bottlenecks. - 3.4.5 Transportation Sector Strategy: Promote measures designed to facilitate efficient utilization of and reduce demand for available parking space. - 3.4.6 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage the development of public transportation as a viable alternative to private transportation.	These issues are reflected in the relevant parts of section 5 of the Planning Statement (Design, Circulation and Infrastructure)	None
	3-502		Community zones description: Paragraph 2. Regarding the limitation shall be at the discretion of the authority. The recommendation is that area requirements such as lot sizes, setbacks, and height limitations should not be at the discretion of the Authority, but approved in advance in legislation. Recommend that these limitations also include noise, waste, and parking limitations/requirements. Also, list the relevant legislation in this section.	This provision allows flexibility for Instructional, civic and community uses which often have functional requirements which cannot be determined prior to applications coming forward. Parking requirements are set out in Regulations, but currently this is also at the discretion of the Authority for Institutional Zones. The purpose of creating specific zones for Institutional, Education and Civic facilities is so that they can operate as required without being constrained by neighbouring uses. Section 3.6(3) indicates that if these uses are proposed in other areas they would need to meet the needs of the community.	None
	3-503		Paragraph 4. Institutional Zones (INS) Recommend adding the Cayman Island Regiment to the list.	Noted, this can be added.	Amend section 3.6(4), as follows: "Institutional Zones will be established to provide locations for hospitals, health care centres, correctional and rehabilitation facilities, <u>Cayman Islands Regiment facilities, and police and fire stations.</u> "
	3-504		Presumably sports complexes, auditoriums, (indoor/outdoor) concert venues, and emergency shelters would fall within the appropriate use zone. Multi-purpose buildings should continue to be encouraged as well as shared parking to avoid sprawl of paved/impervious areas that contribute to rapid surface runoff during more intense rain storms and the heat island effect. Covered parking and where feasible underground parking associated with these facilities should be encouraged, along with provision of adequate laybys for buses, shuttles and taxis, bicycle storage and shower facilities. Recommend adding this into the Planning statement, i.e alignment with the National Tourism Plan.	Section 5.4 of the draft Planning Statement outlines Parking Standards and supports public transportation. Shared parking arrangements would be a matter for landowners to negotiate but the Development and Planning Regulations require the submission of Parking Management Strategies for General Commercial, Neighbourhood Commercial and Hotel/Tourism Zones. Consideration could be given to extending this to other zones. The National Planning Framework includes an action to 'create bicycle parking requirements for all multi-family residential and non-residential developments and encourage installation of employee shower and changing room facilities for large employment centres'. These recommendations can be included in a separate guidance note.	None
	3-505	3.7 - TOURISM ZONES	(Pg.17) - 3.7 Tourism Zones In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.1.1 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Promote the inclusion of renewable energy and energy storage solutions in new and existing structures, including those of critical facilities to promote energy resiliency. - 3.4.3 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage bicycles and e-bikes as an alternative mode of transportation and work with the Ministries responsible for transportation and land use planning to develop strategies to increase bicycle safety. - 3.4.4 Transportation Sector Strategy: Optimize traffic efficiency and address current bottlenecks. - 3.4.5 Transportation Sector Strategy: Promote measures designed to facilitate efficient utilization of and reduce demand for available parking space. - 3.4.6 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage the development of public transportation as a viable alternative to private transportation. - 3.4.8 Water & Wastewater Sector Strategy: Promote initiatives designed to protect ground water resources and achieve environmentally friendly and efficient collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater.	These issues are reflected in the relevant parts of section 5 of the Planning Statement (Design, Circulation and Infrastructure)	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-506		Section 4) d) - Recommend that “where applicable” be removed. It is unclear where these requirements would not be applicable.	The wording is considered necessary since development of land which has a shoreline of less than 200ft frontage is not required to set aside and dedicate to the public a right of way (s.32 of Development and Planning Regulations).	Note duplication of text in section 3.7(4) and so recommend the following amendments: "d. <i>Ensure proposals are not detrimental to the natural or visual quality of the area by reason of its location, size, design or appearance</i> and, where applicable, ensure unobstructed public access to beaches and public open spaces; " "i. <i>Ensure Where applicable, ensure</i> adequate and unrestricted public access to the beaches and the sea, including fire and rescue vehicles; and "
	3-507		Section 4) f) – Recommend adding a minimum percentage or measurable spaces for walking and cycling (if not already done so under existing legislation).	Any specifics for this can be determined at Area Plan stage and reflected in Regulations.	None
	3-508		Section 4) h) - Recommend adding that native/endemic vegetation be prioritised. Recommend change the sentence to “Ensure adequate and appropriate landscaping and planting while prioritizing native plantings and the retention of natural vegetation.”	Noted. This sentence can be amended the reflect the retention of natural vegetation	Amend section 3.7(4)(h), as follows: "Ensure adequate and appropriate landscaping and planting while encouraging native plantings and <i>the retention of</i> natural vegetation; "
	3-509		Section 4) j) - It is currently unclear as to who these recreation amenities are for and what they may consist of – e.g. public open space? Recommend making this clear.	Noted. Recommend amendment to clarify.	Amend section 3.7(4)(j), as follows: "j. <i>Ensure provision of adequate recreation amenities</i> for hotel guests . "
	3-510		Neighbourhood Tourism Zone (NT) That development in the NT zone will have the general appearance of HT in scale and massing is not overly comforting given that such developments appear to be sprawling horizontally and vertically and lack locally-relevant architectural characteristics. It is hoped that development in the NT and RR zones will be similarly “guided by the needs of the industry” AND the desires of the adjacent or host communities through the application of needs assessments to inform Authority decisions. Presumably, height restrictions of smallscale resorts and condominiums would be one distinguishing feature of the NT zone from the HT zone and every effort would be made to encourage support of existing businesses rather than the creation of land use for competing commercial enterprises. Recommend adding these points or clarifying these points in this section.	Section 3.7 states that Neighbourhood Tourism zones shall allow for small-scale hotels and resorts. It also states that the visual and physical impacts of development in Neighbourhood Tourism zones will be minimal and that development will be less dense in scale and massing than those in Hotel/Tourism zones. Furthermore this section states that development in Neighbourhood Tourism zones will be compatible with surrounding properties and built to appropriate densities.	None
	3-511	3.8 - OPEN SPACE ZONES	(Pg. 19) 3.8. Open Space Zones. In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy: - 3.3.1.1 Land Use & Buildings Sector Strategy: Promote the inclusion of renewable energy and energy storage solutions in new and existing structures, including those of critical facilities to promote energy resiliency. - 3.4.3 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage bicycles and e-bikes as an alternative mode of transportation and work with the Ministries responsible for transportation and land use planning to develop strategies to increase bicycle safety. - 3.4.4 Transportation Sector Strategy: Optimize traffic efficiency and address current bottlenecks. - 3.4.5 Transportation Sector Strategy: Promote measures designed to facilitate efficient utilization of and reduce demand for available parking space. - 3.4.6 Transportation Sector Strategy: Encourage the development of public transportation as a viable alternative to private transportation.	These issues are reflected in the relevant parts of section 5 of the Planning Statement (Design, Circulation and Infrastructure)	None
	3-512		Recommend the Authority ensure/prioritize passive open space for Community Open Spaces over “active”. This can serve as a climate resiliency measure eg stormwater retention.	Both active and passive open spaces have value to the community and one should not be prioritised over another (they are dependent on need within a community)	None
	3-513		With regards to the sentence: “The Authority recognises that, in certain situations, public access to Open Spaces (both ‘Public’ and ‘Community’ Open Spaces) may be restricted by management and/or conservation arrangements.” Recommend that this sentence be changed to restricted to guided.	Noted. This amendment can be incorporated.	Amend s.3.8 as follows: "The Authority recognises that, in certain situations, public access to Open Spaces (both ‘Public’ and ‘Community’ Open Spaces) may be restricted <i>guided</i> by management and/or conservation arrangements. "
	3-514		By the strict application of the Passive Open Space definition, which includes “natural beaches”, all unmodified coastlines consisting of beach sand between high and low water marks (Crown-owned) will have POS zoning? Recommend that is made clear.	Noted and appreciate the definition may be misleading. Recommend amendment	Amend s.3.8 as follows: "Active open space can be defined as improved recreation spaces and facilities such as parks, playgrounds, ball fields, picnic areas, boat launches, and other such facilities. Passive open space is typically undeveloped natural areas such as mangroves and natural beaches ."
	3-515		Question: Is POS meant to recognise the Crown-owned protected areas designated by Cabinet under section 7 of the NCA or other Government parcels purchased for (community) parks and non-designated nature reserves? If the former, does this conflict with Section 4.2 NATURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION OVERLAY (NRPO)? Recommend that is made clear.	Yes, POS zoning could be applied to Crown-owned protected areas. This would provide greater clarity and understanding about the extent and location of these areas, for adjacent landowners and the community as a whole. The NRPO Overlay could also be applied. This would not cause conflict since section 4.1 states that the Overlay Zones do not change the underlying zoning of a site.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	3-516		Question: What is the distinction between a park in a Civic Zone (CIV) and that developed on formerly LPP/in Community Open Space Zone (COS) or even POS? Recommend that is made clear.	Section 3.8 indicates that COS zoning relates to privately-owned land which the community may have a right to access. This includes LPPs since under the regulations LPPs serve landowners within a subdivision, rather than the general community. In terms of parks included within Civic Zones (section 3.6) it is anticipated that these would be accessible to the whole community and would be accessory to civic uses, such as public meeting halls / civic centres etc	None
	3-517	3.9 - COASTAL MANGROVE BUFFER	(Pg. 19) 3.9. Coastal Mangrove Buffer Zone. Question: Does this section refer to Private and Public Land with Mangroves on them or just Gazetted buffers? Recommend this is made clear in this sentence.	Section 3.9 is clear that it relates to Coastal Mangrove Buffers, not all land with mangroves on them.	None
	3-518		Existing Mangrove Buffer Zone has not been particularly effective in protecting these vital resources from development due to the interpretation and application of “exceptional circumstances”. Recommend it is made clear if this CMB preserves those exemption provisions or if true protection is afforded to existing mangroves.	It is anticipated that 'exceptional circumstances' would remain, to allow for access through Mangrove Buffer zones. This amendment can be incorporated to add clarity.	Amend s.3.9 as follows: "Coastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB) <i>The Authority shall apply the Coastal Mangrove Buffer policies, and any other relevant policies of this Planning Statement, to ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development , <u>except in exceptional circumstances</u> . "</i>
	3-519		Recommend that the second sentence should recognise the three services noted in the first sentence, and therefore include “carbon sequestration” as well as “storm buffer function and their ecological role”.	Noted. This amendment can be incorporated.	Amend s.3.9 as follows: <i>"Mangroves are among the most productive and complex ecosystems on the planet and are highly valuable in terms of carbon dioxide absorption, coastal protection and contribution to biodiversity. The Coastal Mangrove Buffer zone affords protection for existing mangroves in order to maintain both their <u>carbon sequestration value</u> , storm buffer function and their ecological role. "</i>
	3-520		No mention has been made of restoration and enhancement of this buffer which directly relates to climate resilience, as hazard management strategies to reduce inundation from waves and storm surges. Recommend adding this detail to this section.	Noted, a reference can be added and detail would be contained in Regulations / CPA condition of any relevant project	Insert additional text in section 3.9, as follows: <i>"Opportunities for Mangrove restoration and enhancement to support climate resilience will be supported. "</i>
WR29	3-521		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR30	3-522		Regarding Agricultural Zoning (3.2), what environmental protections will be in place. Currently, clearing of environmentally significant land for the purpose of agriculture seems to occur without any checks. There seems to be a thought that agriculture is not a major threat to environmentally significant lands, however inefficient agriculture can consume a great deal of land, water, lead to nitrogen pollution and other impacts. These must be considered by planning and not simply greenlit.	The Natural Resource Preservation Overlay will be applied to appropriate areas as part of Area Plan preparation. Land Clearing by mechanical means requires Planning approval.	
	3-523		Regarding public open space, will the areas currently zoned as Public Open Space remain as such? Parcel [REDACTED] is a parcel that has been discussed as a protected area for decades and is a significant area of Mangrove, as is the adjacent crown owned parcel [REDACTED] designated as LPP.	Future zoning will be determined within each Area Plan, in consultation with the community, landowners and stakeholders.	
	3-524		Who will decide whether the new Community Open Space in a development will remain as undeveloped natural habitat or for active recreation? Will that be up to the developers or to the CPA? There should be attempts to connect COS on multiple developments to get more effective conservation through combination	The use of LPP/COS within a subdivision will be part of an application and subject to the proposal of the applicant. Should the site have Natural Resource Preservation Overlay, this may form part of the considerations.	
WR31	3-525		The Statement considers the Agricultural Zone for those properties that: 1. Are in their natural undeveloped state; 2. Are primarily used for agricultural purposes; or 3. Have the potential to be used for agricultural purposes because of soil and terrain characteristics and are located over fresh water lenses. In the Water Authority's view the designation of Agricultural Zone for undeveloped land is inappropriate as undeveloped land is not necessarily suitable for agriculture. The type of development for Agricultural Zone on page 12 is single family residences on larger lots or development specific for agricultural use. This type of development appears not to be suitable for the Central Mangrove Wetland Area, therefore we are of the view that a different zoning should be considered for properties that are not suitable for agriculture.	It is recognised that it may be appropriate for some land in natural undeveloped state, even if i doesn't have agricultural suitability, to be zoned AG because of its correlation contribution to water and soil quality and rustic ambiance. Section 4.2 of the Planning Statement introduces a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay which will introduce additional considerations and requirements for key habitats, sensitive landscapes and vulnerable ecological areas.	
	3-526		Point 4 on page 12 in the section reviewing the Agricultural Zone prohibits aggregate extraction activities on prime agricultural land. Per section 5.8, which addresses Water Lenses, the excavation of aggregate above or adjacent to a fresh water lens will be prohibited. The Water Authority supports the prohibition of aggregate excavation on prime agricultural land and over or nearby fresh water lenses. The Water Authority recommends clarification that this prohibition applies to all aggregate extraction activities, i.e. both commercial (i.e. for sale or use outside of the property where extraction takes place) and also for non-commercial aggregate extraction (i.e. for use within the property where extraction takes place).	Noted. These sections can be amended to clarify that all extraction activities would be prohibited.	Amend section 3.2(4), as follows: "4. Prohibit <u>all</u> aggregate extraction activities on prime agricultural land." Amend section 5.8(4), as follows: "4. <u>All</u> Aggregate excavation above or adjacent to a fresh water lens will be prohibited; and"
	3-527		The section for Water Lenses should recognize that certain agricultural practices do impact the sustainability of fresh water lenses, groundwater and soil, and that agricultural activities need to be screened for impact on water resources. Examples are waste management of intensive/industrial type of agricultural facilities for chickens and pigs, and the use of agrochemicals which have the potential to significantly impact fresh water lenses, groundwater and soil. Such activities may need to be prohibited or restricted if impacts on the fresh water lenses are not sustainable.	Noted, this section can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.8(2), as follows: "2. Agricultural development will in general be permitted over a water lens, <u>subject to the provisions and considerations in point 5 below;</u>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR32	3-528		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR33	3-529		I am strongly requesting that consideration be given to limiting/restricting the land use for commercial and industrial development in the district of East End. Any commercial (including apartments and hotels) or industrial development must be restricted to designated and limited areas of the district.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	3-530		I am also concerned about the unabated development of the Cayman Islands which is resulting in the rapid un-natural growth of the population. We need to manage the development. Introduce a plan now - to reduce and phase-in any new development because the existing infrastructure cannot sustain the continued development and the rapidly increasing un-natural growth in the population. The king range comprehensie plan to guide physical development and the overall use of the land must be considered in tandem with the growth in the population.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	4-001		NRPO - Remove This - Not a Development Plan Issue, and not an overlay. An area is either preserved or it has been sacrificed to the later of development. Stop greenwashing. - unless you plan to make the entire country an NRPO (ha) since if we were serious/honest about sustainable development the 'rules' on this overlay would apply everywhere. Which is the change that should be made to the Development Plan, not this 'push sustainable development into a corner with an overlay zone and pretend we're not going to allow unsustainable development by doing so'.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones and Overlays are appropriate in each Area in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands and relevant stakeholders. The NRPO provides a balance in the management and development of land, seeking to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources through additional considerations, mitigation measures etc.	
	4-002		HPO - Same Thing, this needs to apply everywhere. Full stop, end of discussion. If it does not you are showing you true intentions to denigrate the Cayman Islands of our ancestors.	The HPO will be applied to appropriate parcels / properties during the preparation of Area Plans, in consultation with the community and stakeholders (including the National Trust for the Cayman Islands). It is recognised that for a variety of reasons not all historic buildings are worthy of preservation due to their condition and potential to be reused etc. The Overlay allows each property to be considered on its merits.	
	4-003		SCO - Same Thing. This needs to apply everywhere around all three islands. Stop trying to promote inappropriate unsustainable overdevelopment by the back door.	The SCO is a new Overlay and recognises that different coastlines have different conditions and therefore alternative Approaches will be considered in different locations (i.e. setback considerations, design solutions etc) to meet the objectives of the Overlay.	
	4-004		LSAO - Need an entire chapter on them, not a paragraph with explains nothing. They may be a good idea, but I don't see how they can work - or are intended to - work from the little bit included here. Is the intention to throw tens of thousands of acres and thousands of landowners into arbitration overnight as if they were suddenly all road compulsory purchases? I'm fine with that and look forward to the lawyer bills but it doesn't seem to be a viable process.	The purpose of the LSAO is to provide greater transparency about areas that Government intends to acquire for different purposes, as outlined in section 4.5. This Overlay will be applied at the Area Plan stage, where the necessary information exists.	
FF2	4-005		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF3	4-006		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF4	4-007		There are no specific proposed objectives or restrictions laid out in this section. For instance, with no specific criteria, it is up to the CPA to decide arbitrarily what should be protected under the Heritage Preservation Overlay or what minimum coastal setbacks should be established in Sensitive Coastline Overlays. This clearly needs addressing at this stage.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail a range of additional considerations for each of the overlays in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands, and relevant Government agencies/departments and stakeholders.	
FF5	4-008		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	4-009			No Objection	
FF7	4-010		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	4-011			No Objection	
FF9	4-012			No Objection	
FF10	4-013		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF11	4-014		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	4-015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	4-016		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	4-017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF15	4-018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	4-019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	4-020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	4-021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	4-022			No Objection	
FF20	4-023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	4-024			No Objection	
FF22	4-025		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF23	4-026		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF24	4-027			No Objection	
FF25	4-028			No Objection	
FF26	4-029		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	4-030		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	4-031		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF29	4-032		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF30	4-033		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	4-034		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	4-035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	4-036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF34	4-037		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	4-038		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF36	4-039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	4-040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	4-041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF39	4-042			No Objection	
FF40	4-043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	4-044		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	4-045		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF43	4-046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF44	4-047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	4-048		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	4-049			No Objection	
FF47	4-050			No Objection	
FF48	4-051			No Objection	
FF49	4-052		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF50	4-053		YES. We don't need special "overlay zones" there should be dedicated Green Zones where it is clear that development is prohibited and CPA should be bound (no more court cases at public expense) unless public agree and vote for it in a referendum.	Noted. The Area Plans will provide an opportunity to determine which zones and Overlays are appropriate in each Area in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands and relevant stakeholders. The NRPO provides a balance in the management and development of land, seeking to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources through additional considerations, mitigation measures etc.	
FF51	4-054		I fear the attention given to Heritage sites has been ignored too long and has been overshadowed by growth. It all feels a little too late... but it's critical to respect the Islands rich history	The HPO will be applied to appropriate parcels / properties during the preparation of Area Plans, in consultation with the community and stakeholders (including the National Trust for the Cayman Islands). It is recognised that for a variety of reasons not all historic buildings are worthy of preservation due to their condition and potential to be reused etc. The Overlay allows each property to be considered on its merits.	
FF52	4-055			No Objection	
FF53	4-056		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF54	4-057		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	4-058		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	4-059		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	4-060		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	4-061		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	4-062			No Objection	
FF60	4-063		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF61	4-064			No Objection	
FF62	4-065			No Objection	
FF63	4-066		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF64	4-067		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF65	4-068			No Objection	
FF66	4-069			No Objection	
FF67	4-070		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF68	4-071			No Objection	
FF69	4-072		4.5 please see previous response for objection. "I am very concerned with item 4, Natural Environment. I live in the Brac on [REDACTED] I own Bluff to sea as does my neighbor in the west of road. There is a proposition/plan to WIDEN this road as well as create a parking lot. The existing road paved in 2022, extended all the way into the iron shore, destroying tidal pools as well as juvenile species. As of the the paving, the SIRI that lived there was run over by a vehicle. Further there was NO reason to pave [REDACTED] I am the only residence down it, it IS NOT a beach access site, nor a shoreline entry site, nor an area to fish. I have the government's own publications in support of this. The government does what they want, when they want. Please explain to me how the abject destruction of habitat will support the 'Natural Environment'."	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
FF70	4-073			No Objection	
FF71	4-074		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	4-075			No Objection	
FF73	4-076			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF74	4-077			No Objection	
FF75	4-078		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF76	4-079		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	4-080			No Objection	
FF78	4-081			No Objection	
FF79	4-082			No Objection	
FF80	4-083		Without providing a map and outlining the specific Overlay Zones, it begs the question how these zones are being determined? What criteria is being used, and whether or not such criteria is objective, in determining the location & outline of the Overlay Zones.	Overlay Zones will be applied in appropriate locations during the next phase of the Development Plan process; the creation of Area Plans. This will be undertaken in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands and relevant stakeholders.	
	4-084		For land that is existing and not currently subject to such Overlay Zones and its restrictions, there should again be a transition period where landowners may choose to develop and/or use their land as they previously could without being subjected to new conditions. Either a "grandfather" clause which would be relinquished upon the sale of the land or a transition period of some nature would be needed.	Overlay Zones do not change the underlying zoning of a site but instead identify areas with additional considerations and requirements. The 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions will remain in effect until such time as the new zones and overlays come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning.	
FF81	4-085			No Objection	
FF82	4-086		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	4-087		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	4-088			No Objection	
FF85	4-089			No Objection	
FF86	4-090		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF87	4-091		NRPO - In East End the NCC made an interim directive over around 1,200 acres on the basis it is a critical habitat for blue iguanas. However the area is not the natural habitat for the blue iguana. Blue iguanas, bred in captivity have been released on the Salinas reserve, which we note is currently zoned as POS, starting in recently (December 2004) due only to it being the land available. No blue iguanas existed on that land before then. The blue iguanas are not self-sustaining and are maintained by releases each year of further animals bred in captivity. Lately, the DOE/NCC have been doing everything possible to stop any development in this area on the basis that it is the blue iguana critical habitat. This is wrong. The traditional use of the land in this area for farming (for hundreds of years) should be respected and there should not be any Overlay zone on the basis that this is a key habitat for the blue iguana. If the DOE/National Trust want to agree to a NRPO Overlay for the Reserves that is for them, but it should not be expanded beyond those Reserves and should not impact the adjoining and nearby properties. It should be incumbent on the DOE/National Trust to restrict the animals to the Reserves, by fencing or other means at their expense. Given the paucity of dry agricultural land in Cayman, the potential use of our properties as a key habitat for blue iguanas is not an efficient use of the land and given the fact that the blue iguana numbers are only maintained/increased by human interference through topping up the numbers by animals bred in captivity, is disproportionate to their value to Cayman verses the needs of a growing population and becoming self-sufficient for food. In short is runs contrary to the Vision and Strategic Objectives reflected in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the Statement as well as failing to balance the challenges outlined in section 2 of the Statement. Additionally note that the National Trust back in 2019 published its: Strategic-Species-Action-Plan-C.lewisi-2021- 2026-FINAL-1.pdf (nationaltrust.org.ky). The objectives of this Plan, run contrary to the Vision and Strategic Objectives in the Statement.	<p>The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".</p> <p>Determination of appropriate locations for the NRPO will be undertaken during the preparation of Area Plans, in consultation with landowners as well as stakeholders and Government agencies/departments.</p> <p>Issues relating to the NCA are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.</p>	
FF88	4-092		I do not have an objection per se but there is no other way to comment. In respect of Little Cayman, and given its unique characteristics, the NRPO should apply across the entire Island to give it an added layer of protection. Section 9 of the Development & Planning Act provides that: "A development plan includes such maps and descriptive matter..... with such degree of particularity as may be appropriate to different parts of the Islands". Little Cayman is unique and needs to be distinguished from the other more developed islands by the application of the NRPO island- wide.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF89	4-093		Comments, not objections Section 4, Overlay Zones: The Natural Resource Preservation (NRPO) and Sensitive Coastline (SCO) overlays are particularly important to Little Cayman. The entire island should be an NRPO, given the nature of the land and the habitat it provides for endangered species such as the Rock Iguana, Red Footed Booby Birds and Night Hawks. The island is so small SCO naturally apply to the entire circumference; all trees, including mangroves and sea grapes, should be protected from clearcutting as the resulting damage is fast and obvious. Parts of the one village on the island, Blossom Village could fit in a Heritage Preservation overlay (HPO).	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
FF90	4-095			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF91	4-096			No Objection	
FF92	4-097			No Objection	
FF93	4-098			No Objection	
FF94	4-099		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF95	4-100		There is no consideration of Cayman Brac whatsoever in the overlay zone discussions.	Overlay Zones do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands.	
FF96	4-101		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF97	4-102		Please strengthen the provisions for the NRPOs so that we go further than saying that 'development is sensitive to natural resources...' (4.2.3). Development should be severely limited within NRPOs. Using language similar to the HPO (4.4) such as development 'strictly controlled' would be more suitable to emphasising the importance of NRPOs.	The CPA & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. The NRPO aims to enforce sustainable development in areas (privately owned parcels) with underlying developable zoning. This will facilitate greater environmental protection measures when developing within said areas.	
	4-103		The HPOs (4.4) could also be strengthened by using language from 5.10.1 which 'encourage[s] the reuse or conversion of existing buildings' rather than demolishing or removing existing buildings to replace them with new, usually much larger construction.	Noted. Section 4.4 can be amended to reflect this.	Amend section 4.4(4), as follows: "Protect buildings and structures worthy of preservation due to their historic, architectural, traditional or other interest, and encourage the reuse or conversion of existing historic buildings, where possible. "
	4-104		I am glad to see the sensitive coastline overlay but I feel that most, if not all, of our coastlines should be protected. All coastlines should be subject to the provisions in section 4.6 and 'sensitive' coastlines be even more strictly controlled.	As stated in section 4.6, Sensitive Coastline Overlays will be determined based on risk analysis models. The overlay will be applied during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
FF98	4-105			No Objection	
FF99	4-106		String objection to this. This will substantially restrict the land owners ability to use their land and will be constructive possession, there should be clear protocols to allow land owners to opt out or Gov to purchase their properties	The LSAO would not change the process of Compulsory Purchase but is intended to provide greater transparency regarding land that Government intends to acquire for a variety of purposes, as outlined in section 4.5.	
FF100	4-107			No Objection	
FF101	4-108		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF102	4-109			No Objection	
FF103	4-110			No Objection	
FF104	4-111		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF105	4-112		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF106	4-113			No Objection	
FF107	4-114			No Objection	
FF108	4-115		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF109	4-116			No Objection	
FF110	4-117		Highlight the need to preserve natural environments and places of historic significance for present and future generations including natural resources such as the water lens, the central mangrove wetlands, the mastic and salinas reserve and to use alternative methods of deepwells and land clearing in sensitive areas. Identify the known key habitats in the policy.	Noted. The appropriate natural resources for NRPO will be determined within each Area Plan.	
	4-118		4.2 Consult with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands on Protected Habitat and Species.	Agreed. The National Trust will be a key stakeholder in all stages of the Development Plan review.	
	4-119		4.2.1 No speculative land clearing.	Noted. This is recognised in section 5.3 of the Planning Statement, in regard to subdivisions.	
	4-120		4.2.2 Require relocation of protected flora and fauna prior to clearing.	In appropriate locations, and for particular natural resources, this could be a mitigation measure, as referenced in section 4.2(5) of the draft planning statement.	
	4-121		4.2.5 Bonds should be put up to restore failed development.	Noted and recognise the potential benefit. Any development bond would be an issue outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	4-122		4.4 Consult with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands on Heritage Preservation	Agreed. The National Trust will be a key stakeholder in all stages of the Development Plan review.	
	4-123		4.5 State the LSAO targets in the policy eg Barkers, Starfish Point, Mangroves	This will be determined at the next phase of the Development Plan process - Area Plans.	
FF111	4-125		I don't object but this page doesn't allow me to comment unless I disagree so I will add a suggestion here. Developments have a percentage of unused land where this overlay zone could be designated to remain untouched or better used. Between two rows of residential dwellings, their back gardens have a 20' set back, could an alleyway (Small road) be inserted between two back gardens respecting 4.2 natural resource preservation overlay creating shade and an urban green corridor / natural habitat. Most countries states / provinces offer a list of trees according to their growing zones. I own Caribbean Blooms, I offer a list of trees for different habitats. www.caribbeanblooms.ky	In appropriate locations, and for particular natural resources, this type of approach could be proposed as a mitigation measure, as referenced in section 4.2(5) of the draft planning statement. Similarly, the measures suggested are reflected in section 5.6(2) of the draft Planning Statement ("provide a buffer between buildings on neighbouring lots").	
	4-126		Most countries states / provinces offer a list of trees according to their growing zones. I own [REDACTED], I offer a list of trees for different habitats. [REDACTED]	The Cayman Landscape Guidelines document includes an 'approved planting palette". Should more specific guidelines be required, they could be considered as part of each Area Plan.	
FF112	4-127		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF113	4-128			No Objection	
FF114	4-129		see the previous answer.	Noted	
FF115	4-130		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF116	4-131		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF117	4-132		in addition to the overlay zones there needs to be a flood overlay zone. This will protect adjusting land owners from flooding when big developers fill and build	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
FF118	4-133		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	4-134		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	4-135		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF121	4-136		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF122	4-137		We need to preserve areas of wildlife, coastal sections and beaches. There should be more parks and green spaces, more beach access and more national trust areas for everyone to enjoy	The Planning Statement will support the inclusion of parks & open spaces (section 5.9), environmental and coastal preservation (sections: 3.8, 3.6, 3.9, 4.2, 4.6, 5.7) and beach access (section 5.7.11).	
FF123	4-138		Page 21/ 4.3 Airport Approach Overlay While ensuring safety and compatibility of all aspects, the Little Cayman airport should remain in its existant location while being modify to comply with regulations and all safety points necessary. Moving the airport to a new location in land will have so much impact on the natural wildlife of the Island (within the rock iguanas, red footed boobies, birds migration, plants and all on site) by clearing a very very large part of the land to not only suit the aiport itself and a new fire department station, but also roads and parking ability around it.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF124	4-139		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	4-140		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	4-141			No Objection	
FF127	4-142		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF128	4-143			No Objection	
FF129	4-144		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF130	4-145		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF131	4-146			No Objection	
FF132	4-147		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF133	4-148		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF134	4-149		From an LC homeowner perspective, Airport discussion could go here (4.3) or in 3.5 Transit Industrial, or in 5.4 Circulation and Transportation, or all 3 sections. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman's airport are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to Southern Cross Club is LC's Transit Industrial Zone. If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the “additional policies” for airports (5.4.11) are applied, there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our “long-range needs” which do not include jets. Finally, 5.4.12 goes two ways – Ensure that development of a new airport does not impose a detrimental impact on the Natural Environment which is the essence of the gem that is Little Cayman. And is unnecessary and would be ridiculously expensive.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF135	4-150		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF136	4-151			No Objection	
FF137	4-152		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF138	4-153		LC Residents would like to all of LC be on the UNESCO Heritage Site, not just for the Marine Parks. Without a Planning and Zoning Committee, and Plan this can't be accomplished. Maybe this is in the wrong place.	Outside of the remit of the Planning Statement	
	4-154		We really want LC to be environmentally friendly and protected.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF139	4-155				
FF140	4-156		Bad planning	Not specific enough to provide a response.	
	4-157		This section of Natural Resource preservation overlay is quite important for Little Cayman as we continue to preserve and protect our natural resources with the key habitats (rock Iguanas/ red Footed Boobie birds & frigate birds/ migrating birds / Tarpon lake/ various ponds and wildlife/ plants/ trees/ orchids/ mangroves/ coast /turtle nesting shoreline/ water access to Bloody Bay wall snorkeling sites /shore line and more) - This is what makes Little Cayman attractive and special for visitors / tourism. Tourism being the most important source of the Island economy, therefore maintaining a successful economy (as described page 8) for this small island should be encouraged and supported. So everything in the scale of low rise & small density as is currently.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF141	4-158		The Airport approach overlay is a very sensitive point as we all understand that safety guidelines have to be respected, which is why modifications for the existing airport area is important to take in consideration and to analyze thoroughly. The relocation of the airport to a brand-new site in the middle of the Island (along with the roads to access the location, site for the fire department aside and parking space) would involve such a large amount of land to be modify, and such a huge trauma on the wildlife at the location and all around it.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-159		People visiting the Island are more interested into nature trails than roads, into diving and fishing than shopping, and into wildlife than television, into biking than going on public transportation, and is refreshing to know that one of the 3 Cayman Islands can still provide this level of wildness to its visitors.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF142	4-160		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF143	4-161		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF144	4-162		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF145	4-163		Not as pertains to Grand Cayman. But my interest is Little Cayman which is currently a work in progress.	Comment noted.	
FF146	4-164		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF147	4-165		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF148	4-166		Environment Protection should be the most important overlay Zone	The Planning Statement does not reference an environmental protection overlay but instead speaks to a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay. The purpose of the Overlay is to provide additional considerations and information for decision-makers.	
FF149	4-167		Little Cayman is a unique Island> Every effort should be made to protect its natural resources and unspoiled character!!	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF150	4-168		A		
FF151	4-169		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF152	4-170		Give the tragic destruction of Boggy Sands, not sure how these overlays will change anything.	The CPA & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. Overlays aim to provide the Authority / Board with more information when considering planning applications.	
FF153	4-171		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF154	4-172		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF155	4-173		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF156	4-174		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF157	4-175		The Planning zones and Overlays will be difficult to map without a resolution to Little Cayman's airport situation. on overwhelming majority of residents do NOT want or see the need to expend millions of dollars on new facilities that are not desired, and provide no overall benefit and will damage their unique environment. This planning and that of the airport must work hand in hand as one wont work without the other. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC's Transit Industrial Zone. if the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the "additional policies" for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our "long-range needs" which do not include jets.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF158	4-176		Generally no objection, but planning zones for Little Cayman have very different requirements, and some are irrelevant. The overall feel of the documents indicates that what works for Grand will work for the sister islands which is not the case.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will allow the community and stakeholders to determine which zones and overlays and appropriate for each Area, and the particular requirements / restrictions within each of those zones.	
FF159	4-177		No Objection		
FF160	4-178		No Objection		
FF161	4-179		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF162	4-180		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF163	4-181		The overlay zones themselves are good, but the NRPO should be extensive in LC to ensure that the Eco System is not threatened. The whole of LC should be recognized as an environmentally sensitive area.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF164	4-182		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF165	4-183		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF166	4-184		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF167	4-185		Overlay Zones have been for the most part a failure under the existing Plan. One only need look at the continued loss of historic structures within the current Historic Overlay Zones that this concept, at least in practice of the CPA, has failed. Unless there are more specific and binding requirements for all of these Overlays similar to those of the AAO, they will continue to serve no meaningful purpose other than to provide a false sense that a measure of control and protection is in place for these areas in respect to the various considerations.	The CPA & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. Overlays aim to provide the Authority / Board with more information when considering planning applications.	
	4-186		Should Overlay Zones be reformed and strengthened to be relevant for their purpose, the entirety of Little Cayman should be designated an NRPO.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF168	4-187			No Objection	
FF169	4-188			No Objection	
FF170	4-189			No Objection	
FF171	4-190			No Objection	
FF172	4-191			No Objection	
FF173	4-192		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF174	4-193			No Objection	
FF175	4-194		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF176	4-195		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF177	4-196		Please include geological formations in (SCO) sensitive coastline overlay (maybe geological formations preservation overlay needed?) We need to protect landmarks such as Hell, The Crystal Caves, and the Bluff!	A reference to caves is recommended for section2. Suitable environmental / geological features will be considered for NRPO during Area Plan preparation.	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove s and freshwater wetlands, caves, sinkholes and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society and biodiversity ."
	4-197		Coastal development approval should also return to the use of the vegetation line Instead of the high watermark.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF178	4-198		See general feedback and comments (rather than specific objections)	Noted	
FF179	4-199			No Objection	
FF180	4-200				
FF181	4-201		No drafting comments as such but general comments as follows: The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed. Ideally the whole island would be a national park or we would adopt an internationally recognized designation such as 'environmentally sensitive area' so that the emphasis is on nature. We could at least apply a 'Top Down' approach in Little Cayman rather than a 'Bottom Up' approach when applying the Zones and Overlays in the new framework. The Top Down approach would begin by treating all of Little as a Community or Open Space Zone with a Natural Preservation Overlay. The next step would work backwards to carve out e.g., Neighbourhood Tourism Zones or Light Industrial Zones. The Bottom Up approach would begin with "reality" and work up to labeling the whole island as we envision it. For example, Blossom Village is a Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a Heritage Preservation Overlay.	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	4-202		Notably, the Planning Zones and Overlays will be difficult to map out without a resolution as regards the airport. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman's airport petition are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-203		For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC's Transit Industrial Zone. If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the "additional policies" for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our "long-range needs" which do not include jets.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-204		Perhaps the least environmentally sensitive areas can be identified to establish where LSAO would make sense for a proposed new airport (if indeed there has to be one at all). LSAO could also be used for the most environmentally sensitive areas in conjunction with LCDNT to maximise nature trails etc.	The LSAO would not change the process of Compulsory Purchase but is intended to provide greater transparency regarding land that Government intends to acquire for a variety of purposes, as outlined in section 4.5. The identification and designation of Protected Areas is a process administered by the DoE under the National Conservation Act.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF182	4-205		No drafting comments as such but general comments as follows: Section 4, Overlay Zones: The Natural Resource Preservation (NRPO) and Sensitive Coastline (SCO) overlays are particularly important to Little Cayman. Consideration should be given to the entire island being an NRPO, given the nature of the land and the habitat it provides for endangered species such as the Rock Iguana, Red Footed Booby Birds and Night Hawks.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
	4-206		The island is so small SCO naturally apply to the entire circumference; all trees, including mangroves and sea grapes, should be protected from clearcutting as the resulting damage is fast and obvious.	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	4-207		Parts of the one village on the island, Blossom Village could fit in a Heritage Preservation overlay (HPO).	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF183	4-208		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF184	4-209		The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF185	4-210		General comments regarding Overlap Zones: The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed. Ideally the whole island would be a national park or we would adopt an internationally recognized designation such as ‘environmentally sensitive area’ so that the emphasis is on nature. We could at least apply a ‘Top Down’ approach in Little Cayman rather than a ‘Bottom Up’ approach when applying the Zones and Overlays in the new framework. The Top Down approach would begin by treating all of Little as a Community or Open Space Zone with a Natural Preservation Overlay. The next step would work backwards to carve out e.g., Neighbourhood Tourism Zones or Light Industrial Zones. The Bottom Up approach would begin with “reality” and work up to labeling the whole island as we envision it. For example, Blossom Village is a Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a Heritage Preservation Overlay.	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	4-211		Notably, the Planning Zones and Overlays will be difficult to map out without a resolution as regards the airport. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman’s airport petition are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC’s Transit Industrial Zone.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-212		If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the “additional policies” for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our “long- range needs” which do not include jets.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF186	4-213		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF187	4-214		Again, no objections, per se. I would expect the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (NRPO) to be extensive in Little Cayman.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF188	4-215		1. How will the LSAO zone be used (or how can) help preserve or acquire land for future roads/projects? Can it be used in conjunction with the Section of the Roads Act?	The LSAO would not change the process of Compulsory Purchase but is intended to provide greater transparency regarding land that Government intends to acquire for a variety of purposes, as outlined in section 4.5.	
FF189	4-216		Speaking only in relation to Little Cayman - No objection to suggested Overlay Zones, but they would need to be looked at with Little Cayman in mind and how they would be applied. Obviously, Area Plans need to be marked out, with the Overlay Zones being considered along with the underlying Planning Zones.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
FF190	4-217		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF191	4-218		Again, not an objection per se, but more a request for consideration that the Sister Islands, and Little Cayman in particular, require special consideration for protection of the natural environment. More and more visitors come to Little Cayman for scuba diving, bird watching, and the peace and tranquility it provides. I describe Little Cayman to others as “kind of a nature preserve of the Cayman Islands.” I would hope any development plans would take care to consider our fragile natural resources.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas. Also note, the Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6. The NRPO will be applied to certain areas, where suitable, to preserve and protect key habitats and sensitive landscapes.	
FF192	4-219			No Objection	
FF193	4-220			No Objection	
FF194	4-221		NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman so that the ecosystem is protected. Ideally, Little Cayman should be a National Park.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF195	4-222		Some general comments: The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed. Ideally the whole island would be a national park or we would adopt an internationally recognized designation such as ‘environmentally sensitive area’ so that the emphasis is on nature. We could at least apply a ‘Top Down’ approach in Little Cayman rather than a ‘Bottom Up’ approach when applying the Zones and Overlays in the new framework. The Top Down approach would begin by treating all of Little as a Community or Open Space Zone with a Natural Preservation Overlay. The next step would work backwards to carve out e.g., Neighbourhood Tourism Zones or Light Industrial Zones. The Bottom Up approach would begin with “reality” and work up to labeling the whole island as we envision it. For example, Blossom Village is a Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a Heritage Preservation Overlay.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
	4-223		Notably, the Planning Zones and Overlays will be difficult to map out without a resolution as regards the airport. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman’s airport petition are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC’s Transit Industrial Zone. If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the “additional policies” for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our “long-range needs” which do not include jets. Perhaps the least environmentally sensitive areas can be identified to establish where LSAO would make sense for a proposed new airport (if indeed there has to be one at all). LSAO could also be used for the most environmentally sensitive areas in conjunction with LCDNT to maximise nature trails etc.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF196	4-224		NRPO should be across the whole of Little Cayman and then exclude certain areas for tourism and light industrial zones etc.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
	4-225		The airfield is a key part of this and it should not be moved but instead changes should be made to the existing runway and terminal to address any safety concerns.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF197	4-226		I don’t have specific drafting comments, but would like to request a consideration for Little Cayman to have a majority overlay zone of the NRPO when it comes time for drafting area plans. I truly believe Little Cayman has something special going for it and could/should be designated as a National Park, or at least some way of acknowledging that it is an environmentally sensitive area and discouraging unnecessary development.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas. Also note, the Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6. The NRPO will be applied to certain areas, where suitable, to preserve and protect key habitats and sensitive landscapes.	
FF198	4-227			No Objection	
FF199	4-228		No objection but concern for the failure of The Heritage Preservation Overlay Zone in particular to be managed effectively to date. While the purpose outlined is commendable, there needs to be clear policies introduced as to 'how' development within this overlay will be 'strictly controlled' to conserve the historical and architectural heritage. The CPA has repeatedly failed to apply the four points listed in 4.4 p. 21 to either of the two existing HPO's (Boggy Sand Road) and Bodden Town Main Street and now, the integrity of both are severely compromised. This is a crying shame as the preservation of Cayman's built heritage is an integral part of the nation's identity and is linked to the social wellbeing of the country. The CPA should be required to more stringently apply these policies going forward. I am aware that the NTCI produced a "Built Heritage Preservation Policy Paper" in November 2022. There were 7 Recommendations outlined therein. These should be reviewed and adopted.	Noted. The process for PlanCayman, where HPOs are defined during Area Plan preparation, will enable a more thorough review of where such an overlay is necessary, and for which particular properties. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions. It is anticipated that the National Trust will be a key stakeholder in the process of applying HPOs during Area Plan preparation.	
FF200	4-229		The Overlay Zones are generally and theoretically encouraging but, understandably, there are concerns that the Authority's application of the policies may fall short of equal treatment in all cases - for example on page 22 in relation to - "6 SENSITIVE COASTLINE OVERLAY (SCO) The purpose of the Sensitive Coastline Overlay (SCO) is to ensure that proposed growth in identified potentially vulnerable coastal areas is balanced with hazard risk reduction considerations that aim to prevent coastal erosion. Development within the Overlay will be controlled to minimise threats to human safety, properties and the natural environment. Sensitive Coastline Overlays will be determined based on risk analysis models and policies applied will be based on local context and area-specific requirements."	The CPA, DCB & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. Overlays aim to introduce additional considerations and requirements beyond those of the underlying zoning. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions.	
	4-230		Page 20 – 4. Overlay Zones Not an objection – just a comment. Please be very careful. Please do not put so much emphasis on Critical Habitats for various species by reserving wide-open spaces for them that you fail to consider the habitats for the least fortunate in our community. They also need space in order to thrive.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF201	4-231		High-density living can produce serious social and mental problems. Quality of is just as important for them as it is for us who have more resources. A happy population is good for our economy because contented people are more productive!	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability, promoting alternate forms of transportation as highlighted in Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement. Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 5.5 and 5.9 of The Planning Statement also support a mix of housing solutions, access to services, community facilities and open spaces through the suggested zones and policy considerations. Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas.	
FF202	4-232		What you may class as comercial areas, os the home of indigenous and endemic plants and animals.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF203	4-233		5.2 We do not want any PADS or any bigger development unless it nature preserve PAD like a Cayman Islands National Park on the eastern tip Cayman Brac that includes the Lighthouse plateau and the keys (Longbeach) on the lower land on north and south side of Cayman Brac.	It is not the role of the Planning Statement, or Area Plans, to determine the location and number of PADS. PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADS are proposed.	
FF204	4-234		The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed. Ideally the whole island would be a national park or we would adopt an internationally recognized designation such as ‘environmentally sensitive area’ so that the emphasis is on nature. We could at least apply a ‘Top Down’ approach in Little Cayman rather than a ‘Bottom Up’ approach when applying the Zones and Overlays in the new framework. The Top Down approach would begin by treating all of Little as a Community or Open Space Zone with a Natural Preservation Overlay. The next step would work backwards to carve out e.g., Neighbourhood Tourism Zones or Light Industrial Zones. The Bottom Up approach would begin with “reality” and work up to labeling the whole island as we envision it. For example, Blossom Village is a Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a Heritage Preservation Overlay	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
	4-235		Notably, the Planning Zones and Overlays will be difficult to map out without a resolution as regards the airport. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman’s airport petition are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC’s Transit Industrial Zone. If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the “additional policies” for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our “long-range needs” which do not include jets. Perhaps the least environmentally sensitive areas can be identified to establish where LSAO would make sense for a proposed new airport (if indeed there has to be one at all). LSAO could also be used for the most environmentally sensitive areas in conjunction with LCDNT to maximise nature trails etc.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF205	4-236		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF206	4-237		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF207	4-238		The Natural Resource Preservation overlay should be its own Zone, not just an overlay which is easily set aside when large amounts of money is offered for its removal on areas a real estate speculator or developer wants to bulldoze. If it retains only a status as overlay, should be the default overlay for all areas not currently developed or sitting dormant for whatever reason. Such land should be converted to national park status after a certain number of years with that overlay status.	Overlays provide additional considerations and restrictions beyond those of the underlying zoning. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions.	
FF208	4-239		We should include caves in the natural resource preservation overlay. For instance the Nani Cave was discovered in Cayman Brac several years ago, this is a natural treasure but has no special level of protection to preserve it for future generations. If we protect caves, they will be preserved for future generations.	A reference to caves is recommended for section 2. Suitable environmental / geological features will be considered for NRPO during Area Plan preparation.	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove <u>s and freshwater</u> wetlands, <u>caves, sinkholes</u> and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society <u> culture</u> and biodiversity."
FF209	4-240		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF210	4-241		1. 4.4 Heriage Preservation Overlay (HPO) (p.21) The Central Planning Authority (CPA) should not only apply, but automatically be mandated to protect all remaining heritage sites and structures on all three islands. Clarification is needed on the statement of ‘...the Authority shall apply the Heritage Preservation Overlay policies,...’.	Noted. It is the intention to work with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands to identify buildings and structures worthy of protection, along with other stakeholders and the community, and to apply the HPO designation to these properties. However, it is considered that this is only relevant to those properties that can continue to serve a purpose, have the potential for re-use etc, and/or have the support of the property owner.	
	4-242		First, there needs to be legislation that secures the preservation and protection of all remaining historical buildings and sites from entire destruction on all three islands. This is to say that the Central Planning Authority already has the discretion to have a say (i.e.: NO) in whether developers are to preserve or freely knock down historic buildings.	Noted. It is the intention to work with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands to identify buildings and structures worthy of protection, along with other stakeholders and the community, and to apply the HPO designation to these properties. However, it is considered that this is only relevant to those properties that can continue to serve a purpose, have the potential for re-use etc, and/or have the support of the property owner.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF210	4-243		For example, the two Caymanian properties that were on the Waterfront (Da Fish Shack) that were completely destroyed and the home in West Bay the Fosters Group/Family 'relocated' for a sardine packed parking lot. With these two examples, there is no balance whatsoever for the preservation of Caymanian heritage.		
	4-244		Yes, a balance needs to be maintained where the property owners can utilise their land as they see fit, but not at the expense of completely destroying and taking away from the Caymanian people for paved over sites that benefit their private gain. Developers not only need to have a conscious, but respect the identity and characteristics of the Caymanian people that translated into the infrastructure development of the past. A conscious that will stem from the enforced protection the Cayman Islands Government establishes.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	4-245		Respectively, the Government needs to enforce all remaining historic - now heritage overlay zones in all districts on all three islands where all identified, registered and to be known properties of historic and cultural heritage value are utmostly protected.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF211	4-246			No Objection	
FF212	4-247		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	4-248		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF214	4-249			No Objection	
FF215	4-250		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	4-251		How does any of this, across all subsections get enforced? Especially for 4.4 with respect to Heritage Preservation Overlays.	The process for PlanCayman, where HPOs are defined during Area Plan preparation, will enable a more thorough review of where such an overlay is necessary, and for which particular properties. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions. Where Heritage Preservation is included in Legislation, it will provide more support for enforcement.	
FF217	4-252			No Objection	
FF218	4-253		I don't feel like either the natural resource preservation overlay or the historic preservation overlay or the sensitive coastline overlay are enough to protect these areas. The underlining zoning still applies meaning at the end of the day people have choice over their land. We have seen how the currently historic overlay has failed with historic boggy sands' new buildings not fitting character whatsoever. These feel like green washing just to look like the planning statement has some intent to preserve cayman.	The CPA, DCB & DoP strives to strike a balance between environmental protection and development which is woven throughout the strategic objectives of the Planning Statement. Overlays aim to introduce additional considerations and requirements beyond those of the underlying zoning. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions.	
	4-254		When looking at the natural resource preservation overlay action points, i feel like these should be applied to EVERY lot and development. Do these goals not seem sensible to apply everywhere? 1. Preserve and protect key habitats, sensitive landscapes and vulnerable ecological areas; 2. Ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and protects important natural and ecological features; 3. Apply development standards for any development within the NRPO to address issues including, but not limited to, foundation construction techniques, road construction, site grading, drainage, and solid and liquid waste disposal; 4. Apply additional design and submittal requirements, where necessary, to help protect the property's natural resources; and 5. Require mitigation measures, where necessary, to offset development impacts.	The intent of the overlay is to give the CPA the needed policy considerations to be able to adequately protect sensitive and vulnerable habitats that have been identified. Development within these areas must take additional precautions and considerations and this provides the CPA with exercising these provisions.	
FF219	4-255		The NRPO appears to be some kind of proposed alternative to the Protected Areas and Critical Habitats which are already legislated mechanisms under the National Conservation Act. The National Conservation Council is and should remain the authority on if and how natural resources should be protected. Government employs teams of scientists for this purpose. Why would they not be the authority on what should be protected? How can a body that has shown so little support or consideration for protecting the natural environment of our country think it can suddenly decide and implement conservation sensitive policy. In fact the statement says "certain elements of the Natural Resource may be recommended for protection from development." so they would be recommendations with no provisions for binding conditions? What's the point then? It's important enough to be zoned but not important enough to include instances for mandated protection? Let the NCA, NCC and DoE do their jobs.	Protected Areas and Critical Habitats remain a legislated mechanism under the National Conservation Act. The purpose of the NRPO is to recognise other natural resources / sensitive landscapes / ecosystems and to identify additional considerations that the Authority/Board will take into account in decision-making. It is anticipated that these NRPO properties will be identified in consultation with the DoE and the community during the preparation of Area Plans.	
FF220	4-256			No Objection	
FF221	4-257			No Objection	
FF222	4-258			No Objection	
FF223	4-259		Certain Land zones should be set aside for Caymanian young people that are first time property buyers.	This is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF224	4-260			No Objection	
WR1-A	4-261			No Objection	
WR1-B	4-262		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR2	4-263		The relevant section starts on page 20 of the draft Statement. I think DOE will try to push for NRPO over these properties, trying to use the Interim Directive as justification. My view is that would be wrong as the owners have never had the opportunity to be heard on this unilateral action by the NCC at the behest of the DOE. My view is there to be no Overlay zone over the properties. I assume both Cabinet and the Parliament will need to approve the final new Planning and Overlay Zones so would ask you bring our concerns to their attention.	Noted. The designation of NRPO Overlays will be determined within each Area Plan, in consultation both with both Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private).	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR3	4-264		Section 4, Overlay Zones: The Natural Resource Preservation (NRPO) and Sensitive Coastline (SCO) overlays are particularly important to Little Cayman. The entire island should be an NRPO, given the nature of the land and the habitat it provides for endangered species such as the Rock Iguana, Red Footed Booby Birds and Night Hawks. The island is so small SCO naturally apply to the entire circumference; all trees, including mangroves and sea grapes, should be protected from clearcutting as the resulting damage is fast and obvious. Parts of the one village on the island, Blossom Village could fit in a Heritage Preservation overlay (HPO).	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
V&D A	4-265	4.2 Natural Resource Preservation Overlay	This section should prioritize protection of endangered species and their habitats. The Rock Iguana is an endangered reptile that is only found in two places in the world. These are Little Cayman and Cayman Brac.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	4-266		The rock iguana has two main predators: feral cats and automobiles. The DOE has spent several years setting up a program to remove feral cats from Little Cayman. In the past two years they have made significant progress with this program. The results are noticeable in the increase of juvenile rock iguanas now seen throughout the island. No concomitant increase in the rodent population was seen. As part of the DOE plan, cats will eventually be banned from Little Cayman as domestic cats on the island die and are not replaced. This project must be supported. Many transient people bring cats to the island and then abandon them to the wild when they leave. Domestic and feral cats kill not only young rock iguanas but also other lizards, birds, turtle and bird eggs, frogs, and hatchling turtles. We have a responsibility to protect this wildlife. Many meetings with police and other government organizations have been held where residents of LC complained about speeding vehicles and the need to stop them, not only to protect iguanas but for safety in general. The LC speed limit is 25 mph. This allows a vehicle to stop in time to avoid running over an iguana that is sleeping on the road. A higher speed results in a dead iguana. Some way must be found to stop speeding, particularly by large construction vehicles	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	4-267		The DOE is required to review applications for development permits to ensure that natural resources will be preserved, and the natural environment managed in an appropriate manner. I have read many of these applications and the DOE's experienced professionals very thoroughly review the types of property for the proposed development and explain its value. They may suggest that permission should not be granted, or they may suggest methods for development that mitigate damage to the natural environment, such as increased setbacks or measures to prevent flooding. In nearly all reviews of these applications, the DCB has ignored the suggestions of the DOE in favor of granting a permit. They do not give any reasons why they disagree with the DOE; they go ahead and give permission. The DOE scientists are professional stewards of the Cayman natural environment. They factually support their opinions, which should be considered by the DCB. Going forward, the DOE should be given more authority over the DCB and a greater voice in deciding whether permits are granted. They should have the last word on the decision. The DCB cannot simply ignore them and do whatever they wish. The DOE should be setting policy for the preservation of natural resources, not a group of developers.	The role the PlanCayman Development Plan review is to prepare a thorough set of policies, principles and regulations for all Islands, that have been prepared with the input from the community and stakeholders. This will provide more evidence and information for decision-makers in future. Existing consultation arrangements on individual Planning applications are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	4-268		Actions: The DOE program to remove and eventually ban cats from LC should be strongly supported to protect wildlife. The slaughter of rock iguanas should be mitigated by a program to stop drivers from speeding on the island. The maximum speed limit is 25mph. The DOE should be given more authority over the DCB and a greater voice in deciding whether permits are granted.	Issues relating to cats and rock iguanas are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	4-269		The DCB or any other organization that will grant permits for development of LC property should be required to adhere to the advice of the DOE and not ignore or side-step it. If they wish to argue, they must provide specific reasons to rebut a decision of the DOE	<p>The role the PlanCayman Development Plan review is to prepare a thorough set of policies, principles and regulations for all Islands, that have been prepared with the input from the community and stakeholders. This will provide more evidence and information for decision-makers in future.</p> <p>Existing consultation arrangements on individual Planning applications are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.</p>	
	4-270	4.3 Airport Approach Overlay	We are all in favor of a safe airport. However, LC residents should be informed and given a chance to comment on any plans to alter or add to the LC airport. Any airport plan should be consistent with preservation of the natural environment and protection of habitat for endangered species and restricting the number of people on the island.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-271	4.4 Heritage Preservation Overlay	Sites to be preserved and protected from encroaching development on LC include the Booby Pond, which is an internationally recognized RAMSAR site; Owen Island; the National Trust House; the Nature Trail and Loop Trail, and the Mule Pens site. Some homes in Blossom Village are of architectural and cultural significance and should be preserved.	Noted. The designations of properties and sites for all overlays will be determined during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	4-272	4.5 Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay	I lack sufficient knowledge of this subject to comment.	Noted.	
	4-273	4.6 Sensitive Coastline Overlay (SCO)	The Draft Statement focuses on preservation of mangroves to help control flooding and erosion of coastlines. Mangroves are important, but on Little Cayman, sea grape trees are equally or even more critical to protecting the coastline. For example, after hurricane Beryl recently crossed Little Cayman a drive around the island showed that the only locations where seawater crossed the main road and left debris were places where the sea grape trees had been removed. It is common for developers, builders, and property owners to clearcut LC coastline to make it more attractive for buyers. Sea grapes and other native vegetation is removed, including mangroves, and coconut palms are planted to replace them. Removing the sea grapes destroys a crucial barrier to wind, flooding, and other storm damage. Sea grape trees, as well as mangroves, should be protected species on LC. Clearcutting of property and removal of mangroves and sea grapes should be made unlawful and some penalty for breaking this law should be enforced. A special review should be required for removal of coastal sea grape trees and mangroves. Again, the DOE decision on whether to allow removal of sea grape trees or mangroves should prevail.	Noted. While enforcement is outside the scope of the Planning Statement, the designation of key habitats, sensitive landscapes and vulnerable ecological areas for inclusion in the NRPO can be considered during the preparation of the Area Plan. As stated in section 4.6, Sensitive Coastline Overlays will be determined based on risk analysis models.	
	4-274		LC coastline is critical nesting habitat for sea turtles, rock iguanas, and many birds, including nighthawks and red-footed boobies. Building and land clearing should not be allowed in known critical habitat areas. Improved setback requirements for coastal areas may help. The DOE decision should prevail on this issue.	The Planning Statement recognises the need to review coastal setbacks, based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations (section 5.7).	
	4-275		<p>Sea grape trees and mangroves should be legally protected species.</p> <p>It should be unlawful to clearcut, remove mangroves, or remove sea grape trees from coastal property without specific special permission approved by the DOE.</p> <p>These laws should be enforced and penalties applied.</p> <p>There should be no building or land clearing in critical wildlife habitat areas.</p>	See above responses	
WR5	4-276			No Objection	
WR6	4-277			No Objection	
WR7	4-278			No Objection	
WR8	4-279			No Objection	
WR9	4-280			No Objection	
WR10	4-281			No Objection	
WR11	4-282	4.3 Airport Approach Overlay	Point #3 notes that the aim is to "Apply airport-specific safety and security requirements, such as building height, lighting controls, roofing material glare, and perimeter security requirements." It is our recommendation that a process be agreed and communicated for allowing buildings to breach the inner horizontal surface in the eventuality that the regulations allow buildings higher than 10 storeys.	The Airport Approach Overlay, and the various requirements within it, will be prepared in consultation with the CIAA who could advise on whether this suggestion is applicable.	
WR12	4-283			No Objection	
WR13	4-284			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR14	4-285		The NRPO should be extensive in Little Cayman, so that the fine balance of the whole ecosystem is not disturbed. Ideally the whole island would be a national park or we would adopt an internationally recognized designation such as ‘environmentally sensitive area’ so that the emphasis is on nature. We could at least apply a ‘Top Down’ approach in Little Cayman rather than a ‘Bottom Up’ approach when applying the Zones and Overlays in the new framework. The Top Down approach would begin by treating all of Little as a Community or Open Space Zone with a Natural Preservation Overlay. The next step would work backwards to carve out e.g., Neighbourhood Tourism Zones or Light Industrial Zones. The Bottom Up approach would begin with “reality” and work up to labeling the whole island as we envision it. For example, Blossom Village is a Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a Heritage Preservation Overlay.	Noted. Determination of appropriate locations for the Overlays, along with the Planning Zones, will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	4-286		Notably, the Planning Zones and Overlays will be difficult to map out without a resolution as regards the airport. The goals and objectives of the LCPRG and the Save Little Cayman’s airport petition are synergistic. If both succeed, the product – the Little Cayman we seek to preserve – is greater than the sum of the two efforts. Without one of them, we cannot achieve LC preservation. For example, at present, the airport through Blossom Village to SCC is LC’s Transit Industrial Zone. If the airport is moved, the Transit Industrial Zone described in 3.5 will be carved out of the Natural Environment. Existing facilities may be abandoned (or greatly and undesirably extended to meet the new airport facility.) If the “additional policies” for airports (5.4.11) are applied there should not be a new LC airport since it would not support our “long-range needs” which do not include jets.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	4-287		Perhaps the least environmentally sensitive areas can be identified to establish where LSAO would make sense for a proposed new airport (if indeed there has to be one at all). LSAO could also be used for the most environmentally sensitive areas in conjunction with LCDNT to maximise nature trails etc.	The LSAO would not change the process of Compulsory Purchase but is intended to provide greater transparency regarding land that Government intends to acquire for a variety of purposes, as outlined in section 4.5. The identification and designation of Protected Areas is a process administered by the DoE under the National Conservation Act.	
WR15	4-288		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
WR16	4-289	4.2 NATURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION OVERLAY (NRPO)	State how or by whom key habitats, sensitive landscapes and vulnerable ecological areas be determined. Will associated NCA Conservation Plans be referenced in the Regulations? Recommend NCC and DOE are involved in drafting criteria associated with this overlay zone.	It is the intention of the CPA/DoP to consult with the respective stakeholders when implementing criteria for the overlay zones.	
	4-290		4.2.5 How will mitigation measures be determined? Will criteria be included in the Regulations? Include narrative/references to justify policy decisions for mitigation options with the associated policy document.	Mitigation measures will be defined within each Area Plan, subject to the nature of the Natural Resource affected.	
	4-291	4.3 AIRPORT APPROACH OVERLAY (AAO)	Established to ensure safe and compatible land uses and design standards for development within the zone. • Recommend specific height limits be provided to avoid confusion.	Height restrictions will be subject to CIAA recommendations	
	4-292		• Recommend existing non-conforming uses are identified for redevelopment/acquisition efforts (create a trigger map for DoP to assist with their reviews).	Noted. The Planning Statement is concerned with establishing policies for future development. Matters relating to non-conforming uses can be addressed in Regulations.	
	4-293		• Stipulate that replacement or redevelopment of existing non-conforming land uses is prohibited or require to comply with current regulations.		
	4-294		• Provide measures to acquire non-conforming land uses in disrepair.		
	4-295	4.4 HERITAGE PRESERVATION OVERLAY (HPO)	Recommend that any proposal that does not follow the guidelines of the HPO must illustrate exceptional circumstance or mitigation. Applicant should bear the burden of illustrating how they comply with the overlay zone.	Agreed. This could be reflected in Regulations to support the policy (section 4.4) in the Planning Statement.	
	4-296		By what means will CPA attempt to protect culturally significant buildings if located on private property?	The designation of culturally significant buildings for inclusion in the HPO will be undertaken during the preparation of each Area Plan, in consultation with the National Trust and landowners. It is recognised that landowner support is necessary to truly protect heritage properties.	
	4-297	4.5 LAND SUBJECT TO ACQUISITION OVERLAY (LSAO)	Clarify how this concept constitutes an overlay zone. Designating land to be acquired is a contractual matter, not a zoning matter. If the land is not under crown ownership, then this can constitute a ‘taking’ or may impact decisions on adjacent properties based on ‘something that may happen’. This Overlay Zone is a temporary constraint. To create or lift a LSAO, Parliament will have to approve the change, which seems unduly onerous.	The purpose of the LSAO is to provide greater transparency about areas that Government intends to acquire for different purposes, as outlined in section 4.5. This Overlay will be applied at the Area Plan stage, where the necessary information exists.	
	4-298		By what criteria will coastlines be classified? Where will CPA source data to support classification decisions?	Sensitive Coastlines will be determined based on risk analysis models (such as the NOAA Storm Surge Inundation and Wave Impact Model that scientifically measures coastal risk using high resolution inshore LIDAR bathymetry) and factor in rising sea level projections. This data will be sourced in consultation with HMCI.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	4-299	4.6 SENSITIVE COASTLINE OVERLAY (SCO)	Provide examples of what constitutes critical community and transportation infrastructure.	Critical community- and transportation infrastructure includes, but is not limited to roads and emergency routes (rights of way) to and within flood zones, Emergency community shelters and health facilities, and strategic open spaces for response and relief operations that can also function as temporary shelter sites and medical field stations.	
WR17	4-300		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR18	4-301		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR19	4-302		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR20	4-303		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	4-304	4.5	LSAO- Include lands suitable for POS as lands that could be subject to this Overlay Zone.	POS zoned land is already owned by the Crown / Government and so it unclear what the purpose of adding LSAO designation would be	None
	4-305		Add a Flood Plain Overlay Zone (FOZ).	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. However, section 5.5 acknowledges the need for holistic stormwater management solutions, and existing processes seek to accommodate excess rainfall on a site-by-site basis	None
	4-306		Add an Ironshore Coastline Public Access Overlay Zone.	Section 3.8 of the Planning Statement indicates that Public Open Space Zones will include established public rights of way.	None
	4-307		The overlays don't have enforcement – legal effect.	Overlay Zones do not change the underlying zoning of a site but instead identify areas with additional considerations and requirements	None
	4-308	4.2 - NATURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION OVERLAY	Support this zone.	Noted	None
	4-309	4.3 - AIRPORT APPROACH OVERLAY	Support this zone.	Noted	None
	4-310	4.4 - HERITAGE PRESERVATION OVERLAY	Can we request an Overlay Zone for individual properties, as the owner or for example, as you say, something like Elizabeth Street, it might not be ours but its ours?	Where appropriate individual properties and/or areas can have the Heritage Preservation Overlay designation. These would be determined at Area Plan stage	None
	4-311		With the historic overlay are EIAs required? Can we request that be added to this, that if there is a historic overlay that some form of assessment should be done?	Area Plans can determine the additional considerations / requirements that might be necessary within Heritage Preservation Overlays. The EIA process falls under the National Conservation Act and is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	None
	4-312		For Natural Resource Preservation Overlay, and in the next section it specifically says, coastline, what about geological formations such as Hell,	Geological formations would fall under the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay, where appropriate.	None
	4-313		Also, our historic homes, which are very few, should all be bought by the Government and given to the National Trust; and preserved as historic homes; because in the West Bay, other than a grave yard, there is probably no other historic sites.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	4-314		Crystal Caves or the Bluff? Is that under the natural or do we need to put another section just for geological? If the coastlines are so important why aren't the inlands or the wetlands specified separately? Do we need it to be more specific?	The Natural Resource Preservation Overlay will relate to any key habitats, sensitive landscape and/or vulnerable ecological area. Section 5.7 specifically identifies the need to preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Bluff in Cayman Brac	None
	4-315	4.5 - LAND SUBJECT TO ACQUISITION OVERLAY	Lands to be purchased for POS should also be identifiable in this overlay.	Agreed. The text in section 4.5 indicates that LSAO may relate to public parks, future road alignments, utilities, public buildings, nature reserves, environmental protection and endangered ad threatened species habitat	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	4-316	4.6 - SENSITIVE COASTLINE OVERLAY	I want to go back to the issue of “Setbacks” and Section 4.6 talks about the sensitive coastline overlay and reading it says, Subject to the Development and Planning Act and Regulations, the Authority shall apply Sensitive Coastline Overlay policies, to 1. Control development of highly vulnerable coastal areas and 2. Prevent coastal erosion. So, I understand I missed a couple of meetings as well and I am wondering what we as a feedback committee are going to say about that; whether we are having any more to say about that, whether we are going to question it? I heard you this morning, Clytus, on the Radio and you were talking about development benefitting the Cayman Islands and you said you would like to rephrase that, that benefits Caymanians, In other words, if it benefits us then that's something that is much better than benefiting the Cayman Islands, whereas the people are still not benefitting; but going back to this question of Coastal Overlay, I still I'm curious as to what, are we going to say anything about this issue of setbacks because we know that the erosion of the seven mile beach started with a number of things including removing some of the Ironshore and reefs but Marriott Hotel was the mean destroyer of that, and then maybe even worse, adding insult to injury by allowing Mr. Dart to put down his wall on the back of his residence; which used to be the West Indian Club, and now you can't even walk the beach area; you got to go out into the ocean almost, to get around. So that is jumping towards the North, that kind of mentality is coming towards West Bay and if the Aqua Beach property demolition, rebuilding to a 10 story, when its built; without some sensible setbacks or wash- through the bottom, (you know when you have the bottom open or something), they're allowed to do the same thing and we will see the entire West Bay there, the Seven Mile Beach, disappear. So, this thing is urgent we can't even wait until two years from now because if the Population continues the same and there's no moratorium and there's no sanctions, we're going to be fighting a losing battle. So, I want to know what we are going to say about this, if anything? And again, if there's any other quick points that you can give us as to the main highlights of the committee's recommendations that you are thinking about submitting when the paper goes in on the 6th of August?	Noted	None
	4-317		what are we going to do? I say, you want action. As Caymanians we need to get out there with our placards and make a lot of noise and make them hear us, right. If that don't work, then you have to come up with plan 2.	Noted	None
	4-318		Now I have one other Overlay that I would like to suggest, and that's a Flooding Overlay. Flooding is rarely mentioned in the document and when it's mentioned it's not given much attention, again, that's my view. I think we should have a Flooding Overlay so if someone wants to purchase property in an area, they know that area is subject to flooding. Right now, very little is done. As well if that Flooding Overlay is there then you can say to future developers, you do not only have to take care of the stormwater run-off on your property you have to state how your development doesn't affect the rest of the flood zone. Right up here at Batabano Road, is an excellent example of what happens when you don't take the whole area into consideration. I don't recall the water ever staying that long; and it is getting a bit foul when you are driving by now. I imagine the people that live and work there, it must be horrific.	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. However, section 5.5 acknowledges the need for holistic stormwater management solutions, and existing processes seek to accommodate excess rainfall on a site-by-site basis	None
	4-319		It's in my back yard.	Noted	None
	4-320		I love the idea of the flooding overlay; that should be in here, but what do we do where we have ongoing development right now on Batabano Road and we have more development coming online. In general, while a lot of this is being discussed and decided/determined people are building into these areas that potentially would be qualified for the flooding overlays. Additionally, this is perhaps even getting worse through creating additional flooding areas because of the development that's taking place. It's going to keep going. It's going to continue unchecked until all of this is determined. So, I guess what I'm trying to get my head around is if there are any kind of like stopping point to the development that's just going to keep going and it's going to continue to then change the decisioning, that you know once these things are determined the stuff that's taking place now it's going to alter those decisions. Am I making sense?	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. However, section 5.5 acknowledges the need for holistic stormwater management solutions, and existing processes seek to accommodate excess rainfall on a site-by-site basis	None
	4-321		You are making sense and I understand you. Cabinet can issue a policy directive to the CPA to stop, slow down or speed up development (s5.1 DPA 2021).	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	None
	4-322		9. General Overlay Zones Previous overlay zones have been ineffective at accomplishing their objectives set out in legislation. For example, Boggy Sand Road is now essentially unrecognizable as a Heritage Asset despite being part of a Historic Overlay Zone. The overlay zones more of an aspirational aspect of the Planning Statement rather than a practical one? Given the lack of specific policies to accompany the Overlay Zones, it is difficult to accept that they will be able to meet their objectives.	The intention is that Area Plans will provide an opportunity for more detail to be added to an Overlay Zone designation (i.e. to describe why the underlying property requires this designation and what the overlay designation seeks to achieve in that location). This will provide more information for decision makers when considering applications in that location	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR22	4-323	4.2	10. Natural Resource Preservation Overlay The description of the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay Zone (NRPO) makes reference to development standards - what development standards? Have they been developed? Are development standards unnecessary in other areas? The Planning Department should be aspiring to create development standards across all zones to address natural environment issues and not just in this Overlay Zone. Standards to address some of the issues identified specifically for this zone are something we should be aspiring to across the board, and therefore, it does not seem appropriate to mention them within the NRPO zone without also mentioning elsewhere.	The reference to development standards in section 4.2(3) is a recognition that additional standards may be required in areas with NRPO to prevent or mitigate impact to particular natural resources. Development standards are applied in other areas, both through regulations and buildings codes, but NRPO may require additional depending on the nature of the natural resource	
	4-324		Who will be responsible for determining the areas that get a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay Zone? Will this be done to coincide with the NCA Protected Areas, or is this a separate designation entirely? NCA Protected Areas already have protection measures. If a separate designation, how will it be ensured that the most ecologically valuable areas are chosen to have this overlay?	NRPOs will be determined at Area Plan stage in consultation with Government entities (including DoE), stakeholders and the community. Whilst it has not yet been determined, it would seem logical to apply the NRPO to Protected Areas under NCA (even though they already have protection measures) to provide a full picture of Natural Resources in the Cayman Islands and information for the whole community	
	4-325		As we do not have a draft of the new Area Plans, we cannot determine if the proposed NRPO Zone contains all or any Protected Areas or Critical Habitat of a Protected Species under the NCA (2013). If the extent of the NRPO Zone is still being drafted, it would be useful to consult with the Department of Environment prior to its determination.	Noted. The Department of Environment will certainly be consulted at this stage, as NRPOs are being prepared	
	4-326	4.5	11. Land Subject to Acquisition We would strongly prefer that this section should not at all reference the National Conservation Act or environmental purposes. It appears to contribute to the false narrative that the National Conservation Act can sterilize land or take land through compulsory acquisition. The process of making protected areas is already well defined and established under the NCA and does not need further definition as part of the Planning Statement.	Noted. This section can be amended accordingly	Amend section 4.5 as follows: "The purpose of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is to establish a method to designate property that the Government intends to acquire. These acquisitions may be necessary for items such as public parks, future road alignments, utilities and public buildings. The LSAO can also reflect properties that the Government intends to acquire for nature reserves, environmental protection and endangered and threatened species habitat under the National Conservation Act. "
	4-327		12. Protecting Natural Lands Adaptive reuse and vitalization of underutilized or worn down properties would help to stimulate economic growth without unnecessarily adding to urban sprawl. There should be encouragement to site development on land that is already man-modified in general, moving the onus away from the developer to appropriately site their developments outside of primary habitat.	Noted. There is a reference in section 5.10 to encourage the reuse or conversion of existing buildings in commercial zones.	None
WR23	4-328				
WR24	4-329	4.1 Introduction through 4.6 Sensitive Coastline Overlay	Excellently written! No further observations.	Noted	
WR25	4-330				
WR26	4-331				
WR27	4-332		As an alternative to the recommendation for Section 3 to create a Renewable Energy Zone, it may be worth considering the description and designation of a Renewable Energy Overlay Zone, in addition to the five (5) already proposed. Given that the intent for Overlay Zones is to provide additional requirements or considerations for development uses, whereas a Renewable Energy Zone is intended to designate favorable and allowable potential development of Renewable Energy facilities (not to the exclusion of other potential development uses), this may not be the most suitable approach relative to other recommended option. Nevertheless, the principles described for the benefits of a Renewable Energy Zone are applicable to the creation and use of a Renewable Energy Overlay Zone.	Noted and thank you for the suggestion. More research and data would be required to determine the feasibility and demand for introducing such a zone or Overlay in Cayman. This can be considered in future Development Plan reviews.	None
	4-333	4.4	Cultural and heritage assets help define the "identity of the community" which is meant to be safeguarded according to the general vision of the Plan. However, the zones do not speak to this. The HERITAGE PRESERVATION OVERLAY (HPO) is an artifact of the current Development Plan which has no teeth and has been ineffective in preserving what little architectural heritage remains across much of Grand Cayman. Recommend removing all overlays all together.	The 1997 'Historic Overlay Zone' spoke primarily to 'areas', whereas the proposed 'Heritage Preservation Overlay' makes reference to protecting buildings and structures worthy of preservation. These will have to be determined with support from the National Trust for the Cayman Islands at Area Plan stage. This also allows PlanCayman to provide more information to decision-makers about why these areas and buildings are valuable to the identity of a community. This information is not provided in the existing Overlay. The proposed Heritage Preservation Overlay also includes reference to incorporating traditional design in overlay areas. Again, once this information is gathered and set out in Area Plans it will better equip decision-makers on relevant applications in future.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	4-334	4.1	(Pg. 20) 4.0 Overlay Zones 4.1 Introduction – How will these overlay zones be effective as previous overlays have not been? Recommend adding strong language insisting on the inclusion in existing legislation or the creation of new legislation to ensure these overlays are effective.	The PlanCayman approach, which will apply overlays during Area Plan preparation, will generate significantly more information and evidence about each overlay within a given location, to aid decision-makers when applications for forward within a given location.	None
	4-335	4.1	To what extent will overlay zones be determined by technical experts? It is currently suggested at the overlay zones will be determined during the public consultation process for the Area Plans. Is the intent that the public will determine where the airport approach overlay will be? If technical guidance is necessary then this should be outlined. Recommend this is made clear in this section.	The Planning Statement indicates that 'Overlay boundaries will be determined during the preparation of Area Plans'. The preparation of Area Plans will consists of data gathering, engagement with technical experts and public consultation. Relevant experts within government departments, agencies and the private sector will have an opportunity to contribute to the process.	None
	4-336	4.2	4.2 Natural Resource Preservation Overlay - Question: If this overlay recognises the Crown-owned Protected Areas and NCC designated Critical Habitats, what is the underlying zoning classification – POS? It is assumed this overlay will also identify long-recognised environmentally sensitive areas, especially those deemed primary habitat in the screening map per the NCA s41 Guidance Notes v2023-11-28? Will the overlay also cover National Trust-owned (or managed) areas declared inalienable by Trust Council? Recommend these points are made clear in this section.	Zoning boundaries will be identified at Area Plan stage, but yes Crown-owned Protected Areas would likely be POS zoning. NCC critical habitats may have different underlying zoning if they are in private ownership, but the NRP Overlay could be applied, where deemed appropriate. The Area Plan would provide more information on the particular additional considerations that the Overlay would require. The NRP Overlay could also be applied to National Trust owned (or managed) areas declared inalienable, to provide further protection and clarification for the wider community.	None
	4-337	4.2	Recommend adding wording that development will be strictly controlled, similar to the wording in section 4.4.	Existing wording is considered appropriate since NRP Overlays will have different restrictions, considerations and requirements depending on the nature of the natural asset.	None
	4-338	4.4	4.4. Heritage Preservation Overlay (HPO) General. Question. Who is responsible for the Heritage Preservation Overlay Policy? Can this be made clear, who will assist in the development of this policy?	The HP Overlay will be determined in consultation with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands, landowners and members of the public during preparation of each Area Plan.	None
	4-339		Paragraph 4. Who determines which buildings and structures are worthy of preservation? Recommend adding to this paragraph “Work with the Cayman Islands National Trust to seek their recommendations on the best way to protect buildings and structures worthy of preservation due to their historic, architectural, traditional or other interest. This includes at the very last resort the relocation of historic buildings to preserve them.”	While the intention is certainly to work with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands to identify buildings and structures worthy of protection, other stakeholders will be involved since this is only relevant to those properties that can continue to serve a purpose, have the potential for re-use etc, and have the support of the property owner. Identifying stakeholders in the Planning Statement is not helpful since it may inadvertently exclude persons / organisations	None
	4-340		Other than identifying these areas on a map, the Historic Overlay Zone under the current 1997 Development Plan has been a complete failure in its objective “ to promote and encourage the perpetuation of historic buildings and structures” by strictly controlling development. The proposed HPO has an even higher ambition “to preserve and protect heritage sites and structures” using essentially the same policies to strictly control development. Recommend this policy outline the development of a comprehensive legislative framework that recognises, at the very least, the listed assets on the National Trust’s Heritage Register, and offers incentives to developers or owners of such assets to preserve and protect them. Many jurisdictions including the UK have such legislation that can guide Cayman Islands’ legislators.	Noted. The 1997 'Historic Overlay Zone' spoke primarily to 'areas', whereas the proposed 'Heritage Preservation Overlay' makes reference to protecting buildings and structures worthy of preservation. These will have to be determined with support from the National Trust for the Cayman Islands, other stakeholders and landowners at Area Plan stage. This also allows PlanCayman to provide more information to decision-makers about why these areas and buildings are valuable to the identity of a community. This information is not provided in the existing Overlay. The proposed Heritage Preservation Overlay also includes reference to incorporating traditional design in overlay areas. Again, once this information is gathered and set out in Area Plans it will better equip decision-makers on relevant applications in future. Additional legislation to protect properties and offer incentives to landowners is outside the scope of the Planning Statement and is a matter for Parliament. PlanCayman provides a step towards this ambition though and would identify properties that can reasonably be protected as they have potential for reuse etc	None
	4-341	4.5	4.5. Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay. Recommend providing more details on what this means and how/when parcels will be determined, and whether “acquisition” implies “compulsory”. If this section does mean “lands for compulsory acquisition”, then Recommended removing mention of the “National Conservation Act.”	Reference to the National Conservation has been recommended for removal from this section.	None
	4-342		Climate resiliency measures should be added as legitimate reasons for Government to acquire land in the public interest. This may be for infrastructure needed to ameliorate existing flooding hot spots or the application of nature-based risk reduction strategies.	Section 4.5 does not exclude climate resiliency purposes for land acquisition. If this is measure that Government intended to pursue, then it can be reflected with this overlay.	None
	4-343		(Pg. 22) Section 4.6 SENSITIVE COASTLINE OVERLAY (SCO) Coastal hazards that threaten properties and lives are not limited to erosion, but include seawater incursion from waves and storm surges, both exacerbated by sea level rise which is rapidly accelerating. Recommend to include general, language like “prevent or lower the vulnerability to climate-related impacts, such as damage from storm surge, wave-driven waves, extreme winds, etc.”	Noted. This section can be amended accordingly.	Amend s.4.6 as follows: "The purpose of the Sensitive Coastline Overlay (SCO) is to ensure that proposed growth in identified potentially vulnerable coastal areas is balanced with hazard risk reduction considerations. that aim This aims to prevent or lower the vulnerability to climate-related impacts, such as damage from storm surge, wind-driven waves, extreme winds and coastal erosion. Development within the Overlay will be controlled to minimise threats to human safety, properties and the natural environment. "

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	4-344	4.6	Recommend this overlay if coupled with the revised coastal construction setbacks across the islands. Upon completion of this exercise and hazard mapping, it may be that risk cannot be mitigated in some areas/properties by measures noted in point 1, and therefore deemed undevelopable. The second sentence states “Sensitive Coastline Overlays will be determined based on risk analysis models and policies applied will be based on local context and area-specific requirements.” Recommend adding what policies are these and which agency will be undertaking the risk analysis models? How will this interface with the National Conservation Act and Coastal Works process which is at the discretion of Cabinet?	<p>If properties are deemed undevelopable it will likely incur significant compensation issues for government and so policy will seek to determine measures / design solutions that would allow for some form of development (whether this includes greater height and smaller building footprint, or ground floor wash through etc).</p> <p>The likely agencies / stakeholders that will support the determination of Sensitive Coastlines will include Hazard Management and Department of Environment, among any other relevant agencies.</p> <p>Development which is landward of the Mean High Water Mark (MHW) is regulated by the Central Planning Authority. However, when activities extend from the MHW seaward over seabed that is Crown property, including Crown-owned canals in Governor’s Harbour and Lime Tree Bay, SafeHaven and Snug Harbour (Hyatt canal), such development falls under the jurisdiction of Cabinet.</p>	None
	4-345		Recommend added to this section to not be able to permit coastal structures along sensitive coastlines.	Development which is landward of the Mean High Water Mark (MHW) is regulated by the Central Planning Authority. However, when activities extend from the MHW seaward over seabed that is Crown property, including Crown-owned canals in Governor’s Harbour and Lime Tree Bay, SafeHaven and Snug Harbour (Hyatt canal), such development falls under the jurisdiction of Cabinet.	None
	4-346		Question: Are marine Protected areas going to be included in the Planning Statement? Recommend that marine protected areas are included in this overlay and area plans.	The Central Planning Authority regulates development which is landward of the Mean High Water Mark (MHW). It is likely that Marine Protected Areas will be referenced in each Area Plan as existing Policy context, and may inform considerations regarding Sensitive Coastline Overlays and setback considerations.	None
	4-347		Paragraph 2 - Suggestion to include – “Prevent degradation and pollution of coastal-marine ecosystem.	This is an issue for all coastlines, regardless of whether it is a sensitive coastline. Section 5.7 makes reference to preventing marine and land-based pollution.	None
WR29	4-348				
WR30	4-349		There is no mention of the National Trust in section 4.2. The National Trust is a statutory organisation tasked by law with protecting Caymans natural heritage. The Trust currently protects 6% of terrestrial habitat in the Cayman Islands, half of the total protected area in Cayman. This land should be part of the Natural Resource zone.	Noted, the NRPO can be considered for application on NTCI-owned properties during the preparation of each Area Plan. It is recognised that NTCI protects terrestrial habitat and the NRPO overlay will provide further clarification for adjoining landowners and persons observing the Planning Zoning map.	
	4-350		Will protections afforded to the natural resource zones extend past their boundaries. The threats posed by development are often cumulative and indirect. They must be accounted for with a buffer or gradient.	The Overlay will relate to the underlying property. However, this provides context for adjoining properties which, while they would not be subject to the restrictions of the overlay, may seek to provide certain boundary treatments, as necessary and appropriate for the particular location to support their proposals.	
	4-351		There is also no mention of the National Trust in the Heritage Overlay, as an organisation tasked with the protection of Cayman’s built heritage, it should be a part of this process.	While the intention is certainly to work with the National Trust for the Cayman Islands to identify buildings and structures worthy of protection, other stakeholders will be involved since this is only relevant to those properties that can continue to serve a purpose, have the potential for re-use etc, and have the support of the property owner. Identifying stakeholders in the Planning Statement is not helpful since it may inadvertently exclude persons / organisations	
	4-352		How will the protection of the Heritage Overlay zone be enforced? The current protections in Boggy Sands and Bodden Town have not prevented the loss of historic properties or the building of new developments which are not in keeping with the character of the area.	Noted. The process for PlanCayman, where HPOs are defined during Area Plan preparation, will enable a more thorough review of where such an overlay is necessary, and for which particular properties. This will provide more evidence and information to assist the Authority and Board when making decisions. It is anticipated that the National Trust will be a key stakeholder in the process of applying HPOs during Area Plan preparation.	
	4-353		Cayman’s beaches have been disappearing at alarming rates, all sandy beach should be considered sensitive (4.6).	This will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan	
	4-354		The high-water mark based setbacks have proven to be detrimental and should be reviewed. A return to using the vegetation line would be a good starting point, but may not be enough. All hard structures on new developments should be further back and there should be a change in the setback line to any major redevelopment.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
WR31	4-355		The Water Authority recommends including a provision for a quarry overlay zone in the Statement. This recommendation is based on ongoing discussions in the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC) to avoid island wide proliferation of quarries and designating a specific area as a quarry overlay zone that is most suitable for commercial quarries. In the AAC discussions the area where the current commercial quarries are located in Bodden Town is recommended for the quarry overlay zone.	The CPA Aggregate Policy seeks to determine environmental constraints and includes a 'Quarry Siting Map'. This identification of quarry exclusion areas and sensitive areas, is considered more appropriate than identifying zones for new quarries, particularly as the aggregate policy also seeks to plan for a long-term importation strategy.	
WR32	4-356		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR33	4-357		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	5-0001		No PADs. They have proven themselves to be a failed experiment abrogating community control of development to special unsustainable development interests. No PADs.	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0002		"Sea Ports and Marine Facilities 8. Address the long-term needs for sea ports in the islands; 9. Ensure safe and sustainable standards of marine facilities; 10. Ensure adjacent land uses are compatible with future and existing port facilities;" - How do you plan to do all of this from a Planning perspective, or has the overdevelopment cabal designated certain areas for 'long term seaport needs' and not told the rest of the country yet?	Determining the location for future major seaport facilities is a process outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The Role of the Development Plan is to ensure that adjacent land uses are compatible with existing and any future additional port facilities.	
	5-0003		IMMEDIATELY enact "a holistic stormwater Management Plan" for each drainage basin in the Cayman Islands. So that new developments stop flooding out older ones.	Infrastructure will form part of the considerations for each Area Plan. The draft Planning Statement supports long-range plans for a holistic stormwater Management Plan and seeks to ensure adequate stormwater infrastructure and design standards, as highlighted in Section 5.5	
	5-0004		Design - Needs to go at the top of the document, and needs to give two simple goals: make it look good (in keeping with the character of the neighborhood which means keeping it to 2/3/5 storeys as appropriate) and make it sustainable. (Noticeable you don't mentions sustainability as a design criteria in an ostensibly sustainable development plan. This means a lot more than encouraging solar panels and climate change setbacks from sea and ground water).	\$5.6.3 Encourage appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses	
	5-0005		Environmental Preservation #5 ... and other areas of rare geological or ecological or social characteristics in all three islands.	NRPO is responsible for identifying important ecosystems which will provide addition considerations for development	
	5-0006		LPP requirement thresholds need to be reduced. (And isn't LPP becoming Public & Community open spaces now?)	LPP lands are privately owned. It is acknowledged that LPPs should be better utilised, and this is contained in sections 3.8 and 5.9 of the Planning Statement	
FF2	5-0007		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF3	5-0008		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF4	5-0009		The fact that this question refers to "Other Policy Considerations that MAY be applied by the CPA" illustrates the issue. There are yet again no specific criteria to ensure any of these factors WILL be considered appropriately in the decision making process. For instance in the statement the Authority shall... "Prevent the unnecessary fragmentation of large tracts of open land" the specific determination of this needs to be outlined at this stage. It is astonishing that in section 5.7 Natural Resources and Coastline, the National Conservation Act is not mentioned nor are any other relevant policies or pieces of legislation such as the National Trust Law. This obviously needs to be addressed.	Policies and processes determined by the NCA and National Trust Law are separate to the Planning Statement and it is considered unnecessary to repeat and potentially conflict with those pieces of Legislation. Section 5.1 states that 'This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located'. Specific criteria will be determined within each Area Plan, subject to local considerations.	
FF5	5-0010		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	5-0011			No Objection	
FF7	5-0012		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	5-0013			No Objection	
FF9	5-0014		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF10	5-0015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF11	5-0016		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	5-0017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	5-0018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	5-0019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF15	5-0020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	5-0021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	5-0022		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	5-0023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	5-0024		This gives a lot of flexibility which opens the door to abuse of the plan.	The flexibility within the Planning Statement allows for different approaches in different areas, to better meet the needs of those places, as outlined in section 1.4.	
FF20	5-0025		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	5-0026			No Objection	
FF22	5-0027		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF23	5-0028		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF24	5-0029			No Objection	
FF25	5-0030			No Objection	
FF26	5-0031		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	5-0032		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	5-0033			No Objection	
FF29	5-0034		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF30	5-0035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	5-0036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	5-0037		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	5-0038		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF34	5-0039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	5-0040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF36	5-0041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	5-0042		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	5-0043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF39	5-0044			No Objection	
FF40	5-0045		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	5-0046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	5-0047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF43	5-0048		.		
FF44	5-0049		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	5-0050		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	5-0051			No Objection	
FF47	5-0052			No Objection	
FF48	5-0053		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF49	5-0054		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF50	5-0055		Little to nothing addressing real environmental and sustainability issues. Just a ticket to continue to destroy the islands.	Noted, more detail will be provided within each Area Plan, as outlined in section 1.4	
FF51	5-0056		All I see is how Cayman hopes to cover every inch of the island with buildings. Removing the protective mangroves... it's ongoing assault to the island	The Planning Statement seeks to balance competing demands for the use of land, as outlined in section 3.1.	
FF52	5-0057			No Objection	
FF53	5-0058		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF54	5-0059		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	5-0060		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	5-0061		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	5-0062		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	5-0063		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	5-0064			No Objection	
FF60	5-0065		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF61	5-0066			No Objection	
FF62	5-0067			No Objection	
FF63	5-0068		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF64	5-0069			No Objection	
FF65	5-0070		it seems like some version of built up miami and disney combined is the intention. the zoning means that it will be too easy in the context of these guidelines to build.	The Planning Statement seeks to balance competing demands for the use of land, as outlined in section 3.1.	
	5-0071		there seems very little references to environment, natural disaster management, impact on grid and other utilities in all of this	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement. The document speaks to the environment in Sections 3.7.4, 3.8, 3.9, 4.2, 4.6, 5.5.3, 5.5.5, 5.5.6, 5.5.10, 5.7, and 5.8, natural disaster management under Section 1.6, 3.7.4.g, 4.2.5, 4.6.2 and the support for the provision of infrastructure in Sections 1.6, 4.6.3, 5.3.4, 5.4 and 5.5.	
FF66	5-0072		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF67	5-0073		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF68	5-0074			No Objection	
FF69	5-0075			No Objection	
FF70	5-0076			No Objection	
FF71	5-0077		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	5-0078			No Objection	
FF73	5-0079		T		
FF74	5-0080			No Objection	
FF75	5-0081		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF76	5-0082		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	5-0083			No Objection	
FF78	5-0084		Under 5.3, Subdivision of Land, there is a statement that land clearing should wait... until planning permission is granted. I would add that building of roads should wait until planning permission is granted to build on a particular parcel. There are more than 1000 undeveloped parcels and several large subdivisions on LC that have been fully build out with roads but not one building has been granted planning permission because none have applied. Every time a new subdivision is approved and new roads are constructed, there is an environmental impact. If there is no intention to develop these lots, then there is no social benefit or improved living environment for the people of Little Cayman to set against that environmental impact. These subdivisions cause environmental harm from habitat fragmentation and habitat loss, as well as the resource implications that result from the construction of roads and development of infrastructure for these subdivisions.	Roads, water and other utilities are standard components of subdivisions that are required from developers. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF79	5-0085			No Objection	
FF80	5-0086			No Objection	
FF81	5-0087		With respect to Little Cayman, a number of current Planning Regulations in place for Grand Cayman are inappropriate for Little Cayman given its unique character and the desires of the vast majority of people who live there or own vacation property on the island. For instance, the height limitations in the Planning Regs do not suit LC - the consensus view is that there should be a limit of 2 habitable stories, with the possibility to have these raised above a cistern or wash-through for flood control purposes. Additionally, LC, with a population of less than 200, I understand has over 1,000 undeveloped parcels of land of 0.5 acre or less. Any sub-division resulting in more than 10 parcels ought to be carefully scrutinised until this number of sub-division lots with no building is significantly reduced. The objective of LC residents and homeowners is that the island should remain lightly developed (not no further development) with the preservation of large parcels of land to be encouraged. As such, the requirement in Planning Regs to designate a public right of way from the road to the sea of 6 feet wide for every 200 feet of frontage (or part thereof) when getting Planning permission to develop an oceanfront lot of more than 200 feet frontage runs counter to this objective.	Proposed zones in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF82	5-0088		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	5-0089		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	5-0090			No Objection	
FF85	5-0091			No Objection	
FF86	5-0092		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF87	5-0093		Water Lens: providing any aggregate excavation is done above the water lens and does not endanger the water lens it should be permitted.	The prohibition of aggregate excavation over or nearby fresh water lenses is supported by relevant Agencies and Government Departments. Furthermore, it has been recommended that this prohibition applies to all aggregate extraction activities, i.e. both commercial (i.e. for sale or use outside of the property where extraction takes place) and also for non-commercial aggregate extraction (i.e. for use within the property where extraction takes place).	
	5-0094		Planned Area Developments (PADs) should not be permitted in Little Cayman, given its unique and quaint characteristics.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0095		Subdivision of Land across all three Islands should be better regulated to ensure clearing does not take place until planning permission has been granted to build on a subdivided lot. This includes the building of roads with permanent surfaces. In Little Cayman alone, there are approximately 1,000 undeveloped subdivisions with roads, creating scars on the land disrupting or destroying nature.	Roads, water and other utilities are standard components of subdivisions that are required from developers. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	5-0096		Circulation and Transportation: while this type of planning is necessary for Grand Cayman, if not too late, it has far less application to Little Cayman.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0097		Most of the considerations under this heading do not apply to Little Cayman and where they do, such as roads, airports and seaports, they have to take account of the unique characteristics of the island.	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0098		The current indiscriminate clearing or widening of roads in Little Cayman is done without notice and care to avoid destroying natural habitats and unique flora, not to mention that widening roads leads to speeding which is the cause of the most indigenous rock iguana deaths in recent history.	Outside the remit if the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF88	5-0099		Much care has to be given to these other policy considerations as they relate to Little Cayman. Infrastructure: In relation to Little Cayman, this must all take account of its unique characteristics and where land is already in use for things like Solid Waste & Roads, these should be enhanced without further expansion. An operational incinerator, like in the past, helps to reduce the spread of solid waste on the current site. Roads are adequate in Little Cayman and the natural surfaces which mostly are on the north coast, add to the charm of Little Cayman. Asphalt is ugly and out of character. Dirt roads also reduce speeding and who of us doesn't need to slow down these days? That is the reason most people go to Little Cayman, to slow down. Please leave it that way.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0100		Design: Setbacks on lands in Little Cayman should be increased to allow for as much vegetation and air between buildings as well as to discourage over-sized homes that are out of character to the cottage style homes that currently exist. Increased Setbacks are also necessary given the narrow size of much of the land which, especially on the Northcoast, is susceptible to wave action and erosion as experienced as recently as Beryl. Building Design must also take into account the laid back, tropical vibe that is Little Cayman. Modern, rectangular, flat roof designs are entirely out of character for Little Cayman and should be banned. Take a page out of the books of Key West, St Barths for inspiration. Building heights should be restricted to 2 floors of living space with an upper floor counting as the 1st floor where the house is built on posts. Natural Resources: I support these safeguards but believe more robust regulations are required to truly safeguard our natural resources. When they are gone, we can never get them back.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0101		I note that the Brac Bluff is the only list geologically significant natural resource however all 3 Islands have unique cave systems, fresh water wells, ironshore, and other geographical areas of significance. These must all be catalogued and protected and not subject to negotiation on any planning application. Water Lenses: Ditto. This is a God-given natural resource that is priceless and must be safeguarded at all costs.	Noted, it has been recommended to amend s2.4 to include high level references to caves, sinkholes and other natural features. Each Area Plan will include identification of appropriate features to include as Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (NRPO) where additional considerations will be determined.	
	5-0102		Parks, Recreation & Open Spaces: These all come naturally in Little Cayman. There is no need for any improvements and certainly no need for built "enhancements". Little Cayman has a small community park that is adequate.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0103		The population of Little Cayman is so small, there is no need for football pitches or other amenities. Part of the charm is in not having these facilities. Many people bike to enjoy the natural environment and clean air. If the roads are safe, this practice should be encouraged and avoids the need for built exercise facilities. There is lots of open space to play football, basketball and other team sports. One resort as a tennis court that is hardly used. Little Cayman should be left the way it is.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
FF89	5-0104		Comments, not objections Section 5, Other Considerations: section 5.3, subdivisions, Little Cayman in particular has suffered from clearcutting of land on which nothing is then built. No such cutting should be allowed without planning permission of specific structures requiring clearing.	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission.	
	5-0105		Section 5.5, infrastructure: much of the proposed development on Little Cayman would exceed the technical capacity of the infrastructure of the island, be it in terms of sewage treatment, water availability, road capacity and structural capability, and power supply.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
	5-0106		Specifically with regard to roads, it is ridiculous that most of the roads are paved using "tar patch", which degrades within a couple of years. If the roads were altered to include "traffic calming" techniques widely used in other countries (zig-zags, narrow sections, speed bumps and other techniques to reduce speed) protection of wildlife on Little Cayman would be enhanced without the need to post traffic enforcement officers widely.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0107		Section 5.7, Natural Resources: Much of the proposed development on Little Cayman is designed with no thought to the considerations discussed in this section. More comments were made elsewhere; in summary the natural resources and environment of Little Cayman are what make it special for the residents and the economic magnet it is for the Cayman Island as a whole.	An updated development plan is long overdue. For this reason we are currently undergoing the process to have an updated plan that will reflect the needs of the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF90	5-0108			No Objection	
FF91	5-0109			No Objection	
FF92	5-0110			No Objection	
FF93	5-0111			No Objection	
FF94	5-0112		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF95	5-0113		No mention whatsoever of the environmentally dangerous Cayman Brac dump. It's not even a landfill- it's a dump. Toxic chemicals leach into the soil; both residents right across from the Brac dump died of cancer; there is mutated, strange plant life on the Brac south side waters where the toxic Brac dump chemicals leach into the sea; there is an open pit of medical waste right next to where people walk/drive.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan. As outlined in section 5.5, the role of the Development Plan is to support long-range plans for solid waste facilities and to ensure compatible land uses are adjacent to and in the vicinity of existing and future solid waste management facilities.	
FF96	5-0114			No Objection	
FF97	5-0115		I strongly object to section 5.2 which suggests that PADs are permissible within NRPOs, HPOs, ERs, etc. especially since they are by definition (according to the document) for 'large tracts of land'. The existing and planned PADs, as indicated on the map in the document, are all very large and have significant impacts on the natural environment, infrastructure, etc. This is at odds with section 5.7.1-3 that suggests an effort to 'minimise the impact of major developments on the natural environment... the loss of important vegetation... minimise the impact on natural ecosystems', etc.	Any development whether PAD or residential that is within a NRPO or HPO will be subject to more stringent guidelines to facilitate sustainable development. Also, as per Section 5.2 of the Planning Statement, The Authority may require natural buffers and/or transitional massing and scale at site peripheries in order to ensure no adverse impacts on character and value of surrounding lands - promoting compatibility.	
	5-0116		As indicated in my previous comments, I would love to see the 'Coastal Zone Management' section strengthened to discourage further development on our coastlines and/or to be more precise about 'appropriate coastal setbacks'. The social, environmental and climate resiliency considerations of our people should, in this area, outweigh economic temptations to continue to build in coastal zones.	Coastal setback, building heights and massing will be addressed in the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan.	
FF98	5-0117			No Objection	
FF99	5-0118		They way these questions are posed are too loaded to yield effective responses. 5.3- generally I think this is a good idea but care taken to understand the fine details and risk of increasing costs, which is a real concern. I did notice in the entities consulting on the first few pages of the document you only consulted gov entities and not developers, contractors, CASE etc, why is that?	Public consultation on the Planning Statement was open to all members of the public / government / business entities during the 2 month consultation period, as required by the Development and Planning Act.	
	5-0119		5.5 generally i agree, I do think Gov needs to support utilities/developers to bury their power lines underground as is much more resilient to storms, this is required in Bermuda. Any reason could not subsidise this partially to encourage it?	Noted, in consultation with relevant infrastructure providers, it is suggested to amend section 5.5 to minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: "Electricity and Street Lighting 12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources; 13. <i>Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</i> 14. <i>Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</i>
	5-0120		5.6 yes agree, think that is good.	Noted	
FF100	5-0121			No Objection	
FF101	5-0122		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF102	5-0123			No Objection	
FF103	5-0124		5.3 subdivision of land. In current policies, we are creating land subdivisions mainly for residential use due to the policy of zoning there are no neighborhood commercial zones included in these projects, and thus end-users have to drive to shops outside the subdivision - not good sustainable development. Thus, depending on the size of the project there should be a zone to allow shops or offices to be built with the subdivision to service the local population. Maybe is done on land area percentage.	Noted. Existing regulations allow for mixed use within subdivisions. Threshold requirements could be considered in each Area Plan to incorporate mixed use in 'large' subdivisions.	
	5-0125		Cayman currently works on a spyder network of roads connecting tracks of housing without local (walkable less than a mile) services. I understand in the current planning code developers are meant to provide community buildings depending on the size of the development - this should published so the public knows in advance and enforced so Cayman benefits from the increased built environment as the current laws intended.	Section 30 of the Development and Planning Regulations requires school provision within large subdivisions. Regulations are published on the Department of Planning website.	
	5-0126		5.5 infrastructure - currently there is no mandatory layout of how services are placed under the roads, therefore they are put randomly which makes road maintenance a nightmare in addition to trying to connect to these services - it should be a requirement of planning to provide as-built drawings of where these services are and adopt a standard layout as used everywhere else in the world to place these services so interconnection becomes simple for the future. Secondly, all commercial buildings should have a wastewater stub from their current STP to the road so that a some point when national sewage pipes lines are required it is simple to connect up the country. If it is in planning requirements then it is known in advance of the project. The document statements are once again too vague nothing will happen - add item 3 from solid waste to wastewater too. Currently, there is grey greywater option in the law - this is key to sustainable development for the future.	Road construction is under the remit of the National Roads Authority. Wastewater treatment requirements are determined by the Water Authority through consultation of development applications. It's noted that the processes could be more standardised in future and the Department / Ministry is working to progress this. The Planning Statement encourages the implementation of the latest technologies to minimise the environmental impact of wastewater treatment practices (section 5.5(6)). A reference to supporting long-range plans for wastewater treatment can be added to section 5.5	Amend section 5.5, to include the following additional bullet point: Wastewater <i>- Support long-range plans for future wastewater treatment facilities;</i>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0127		Stormwater - add a planning requirement to have oil/water separators for commercial projects to waste vehicle oil/fuel from entering the subterranean water system is this known to cause cancer and kill the organic bacteria that clean the wastewater from septic tanks discharge underground.	Requirements for in-the-ground interceptors (for grease or oil-grit or lint) typically are set by the Water Authority through consultation on individual applications.	
	5-0128		General - allow interchangeable zone areas in a mile radius of currently established settlements. Currently, GT has different zoning requirements to the other established settlements around the country therefore using historical data is floored as less favorable zoning was for the areas outside GT. ie heights of buildings and types of buildings.	The proposed Area Plan process will allow for locally suitable requirements to meet the needs of those places.	
	5-0129		5.6 Design - Require 10% of energy for residential properties to come from nonfossil sources. Cayman has 90% of sunny days and therefore solar hot water or PV is much easier here, the current generation law allows power generated on the property to be used on the property without cuc permission and they are still required by law to provide you with power, therefore low wattage items can be powered off the grid, or solar hot water (I produced all my hot water this way since 2009) or grid-tied power. Requires new buildings to have roof insulation (60% of heat gain is through the roof) as a planning requirement. The government already has a department looking at this so it is an easy and cheap way to be sustainable.	Section 5.5.12 of the Planning Statement states, "support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources". Once such mechanisms and strategies are approved, they will be factored into the Development Plan process. The Government's National Energy Policy Unit provides advice and energy saving guides for all properties.	
	5-0130		5.7 - Coastline ground floor bedrooms should be banned within a set distance from the coast, as it is on the Gulf Coast states which are at risk from storm surge flooding to prevent deaths at night.	Noted. The draft Planning Statement introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay which seeks to control development of highly vulnerable coastal areas. Specific requirements will be included in each Area Plan, subject to the particular constraints identified. The Planning Statement also recognises the need to review coastal setbacks.	
FF104	5-0131		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF105	5-0132		Oh 23. Right now, no more subdivisions for little cayman should be passed. There are too many residential roads already with no houses on them.	Roads, water and other utilities are standard components of subdivisions that are required from developers. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	5-0133		Oh 25. We need a sewage containment tank for little cayman before further development allowed. Don't let little cayman allow any more builders here. Period. Pushed development not what we are about. It was a home a year until Covid. No more residential multihome house tracts. Please stop until infrastructure in place. Have lived here 2 nd longest on island, 36 years and concerned.	The Area Plan for Little Cayman will be prepared in consultation with the community, and the infrastructure needs will be considered as part of the plan.	
FF106	5-0134			No Objection	
FF107	5-0135		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF108	5-0136		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF109	5-0137		5.5 Stormwater and drainage The plan only references a 'holistic' stormwater management plan. At the meetings, we're told that stormwater management will be addressed in area plans, but surely we need a national policy to guide the country's approach to stormwater management, applied at a more local level with specifics. The document does not say which entity is responsible for stormwater management nor give any sense of urgency. With climate change and increased in frequency/severity of storms, stormwater management needs to be given higher priority and addressed at a national level.	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0138		5.7 National resources and coastline How can there be a whole section on environmental protection without any reference to the National Conservation Act? In fact, it references the "Natural Resources policies and other relevant polices of hte Planning Statement" rather than the NCA. How does the Planning Statement work alongside the NCA? Given the past tensions between CPA and NCC, it would be helpful to have better definition here.	Policies and processes determined by the NCA re separate to the Planning Statement and it is considered unnecessary to repeat and potentially conflict with those pieces of Legislation.	
FF110	5-0139		5.2 - establish minimum % of the 3 different land uses to qualify as a PAD (eg a PAD that is primarily residential is not a PAD) and increase the fees payable for each change to these uses during the course of the build out. Strongly object to PADs in NRPO zones. How many PADs will Grand Cayman facilitate?	<p>PADs include flexibility over the proportion of each use to allow for different types of master-planned developments (i.e. subject to the requirements of the applicant). Fees are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>PADs within a NRPO or HPO will be subject to more stringent guidelines to facilitate sustainable development. Also, as per Section 5.2 of the Planning Statement, The Authority may require natural buffers and/or transitional massing and scale at site peripheries in order to ensure no adverse impacts on character and value of surrounding lands - promoting compatibility.</p> <p>The number of PADs is not determined and is subject to market demand. The Regulations determine the information that is required to be included in a PAD Development Statement.</p>	
	5-0140		5.3 - subdivisions to be designed to incorporate and retain established mature trees along the access roads	Section 5.3 states that plans for subdivisions should embrace the natural environment by retaining natural vegetation, key landscape features and environmentally significant elements.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0141		5.3 - subdivisions to require natural boundary drainage swales in low lying and flood prone zones incorporating wetland species	Section 5.3 states that plans for subdivisions should control and retain storm-water runoff and protect property from flood damage.	
	5-0142		5.5.7 - the policy must prioritize a national stormwater management plan and be holistic, identify vulnerable areas where development would exacerbate flooding concerns eg South Sound wetlands, Windsor Park; establish separate authority with qualified experts to review submitted stormwater mangement plans, increase the rainwater catchment to meet climate change predicted measurements;	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the Development Plan when completed.	
	5-0143		ensure waste water processing requirements for large development; consider grey water reuse with proper regulatory guidelines.	Wastewater treatment requirements are determined by the Water Authority through consultation of development applications.	
	5-0144		5.6 keep the original 1997 policy to retain and speak to custom Cayman design and heritage	The HPO section of the Planning Statement (section 4.4) states that development within the Overlay will be strictly controlled to conserve the Cayman Islands' historical and architectural heritage. Outside of the HPO the Authority will encourage appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses.	
FF111	5-0145		Must define development; a coastal shore restoration is not a development. This body should enable environmental groups that are actively minimizing erosion / destruction, as it is in your 5.7 natural resources & coastline. I am currently working on such a project, planning is making the advancement of this project very difficult.	Development is defined in section 13(3) the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision).	
	5-0146		5.8 Water lenses - Side road curbs & round about should have a 2" hole to allow water to escape and not pool along roadside or flood areas such as Countryside church. Certain roundabouts should be depressed to allow rainwater to replenish natural lenses. Of course here you need a hole in the curb. Countryside roundabout has a natural crevasse that was packed instead to allow water to escape into it. Vegetation would play a big role to drink excess water	Highway design and constructions falls under the remit of the National Roads Authority.	
FF112	5-0147		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF113	5-0148		We're really not addressing the elephant in the room, are we. We need to STOP or at least SLOW DOWN the population increase. This plan sounds lovely, but just like the environmental plan needs the political will to actually be adopted. I'm also missing time lines for any type of implementation.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF114	5-0149		see the previous answer.	Where possible each Area Plan will include measurable objectives.	
FF115	5-0150		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF116	5-0151		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF117	5-0152		Page 27 5.7 -12 At all cost coastline panoramic view must be preserved. There are very few areas in the islands that the sea can be seen from main roads, eg South Sound in the area by the Government dock and just before entering the district of East End	The Planning Statement was drafted with the understanding of the public's desire to preserve these sights and addresses same as stated in Section 5.7.12	
	5-0153		Page 23 5.2 How will PADs befit Caymanians	The Development Plan is a long-range land use plan for the Cayman Islands. The benefits to individual communities will be indirect (i.e. housing, employment etc, depending on the nature of the project / PAD).	
	5-0154		5.3 Side walks in subdivision will only drive up the price of land that is already beyond the average Caymanians	Noted. Sidewalks are not typically required for subdivisions. The NRA has Subdivision Regulations which include sidewalks and any policies that are considered appropriate to support this in different neighbourhoods can be considered within Area Plans.	Consider Sidewalks in Subdivisions in each Area Plan (consider whether suitable in different residential zones)
FF118	5-0155		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	5-0156		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	5-0157		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF121	5-0158			No Objection	
FF122	5-0159		Flooding is a major issue for the island we must ensure that drainage is substantial.and drains maintained.	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0160		Solar power should also be made available to every.honeowner with government subsidies to purchase them and the opportunity to sell the energy to cuc.	Government subsidies are outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0161		We should have more electricity and water providers so there is reasonably priced elec and water.. plus weshould have more phone providers with better package deals which can be accessed from all areas-	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0162		these providers should also be able to lay their pipes etc at the same time as construction to prevent roads constantly being dug up as well as reduce the pollutants	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF123	5-0163		No development of any large tracts of Land in Little Cayman No subdivision of land or apply appropriate smaller scale designs for Little Cayman	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	5-0164		Keeping the necessary development of roads and all other necessary infrastructures to the minimum space within the already developed portion of the Blossom village and around the resorts areas.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. At the Area Plan phase, prioritization of objectives will be brought forward and considered.	
	5-0165		Assure a proper parking facility around the airport	Section 5.4.11 of the Planning Statement indicates that the Authority / Board will "support the long-range needs and alternatives for all types of airport facilities throughout the Cayman Islands."	
	5-0166		Port and marine facilities development being kept to its minimum ensuring the respect of the natural resources and coastline.	Section 5.4.9 of the Planning Statement indicates that the Authority / Board will "ensure safe and sustainable standards of marine facilities."	
FF124	5-0167		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	5-0168		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	5-0169			No Objection	
FF127	5-0170		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF128	5-0171			No Objection	
FF129	5-0172		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF130	5-0173		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF131	5-0174		Page 24: Airports You need to ensure airport development does not lead to desructction of vulnrable habitats for critically endangered species. For example, the current Little Cayman airport should be maintained for the preservation of the island, and the undeveloped habitat. Building a new airport will destroy marginal habitats that are unique around the world, and lead to further declines in populations of critically endangered species.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF132	5-0175		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF133	5-0176		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF134	5-0177		On Electricity and Street Lighting (5.5.12) urge inclusion of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) as one of the alternative energy sources to be evaluated.	The Planning Statement is drafted to support all alternative energy sources, the suitability of which can be determined in due course in consultation with appropriate stakeholders.	
FF135	5-0178		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF136	5-0179		Zoning in Little Cayman is not included in the policy statement	The Planning Statement covers all islands, whereas each Area Plan will be specific to the indicatives areas (section 1.4).	
FF137	5-0180				
FF138	5-0181		LC wants its own Planning Board, so it can be specific to the needs of the island, for environmental protection for what makes LC special here for tourism as well as residents alike.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF139	5-0182		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF140	5-0183		Sane		
FF141	5-0184		Little Cayman is a special place, and we need to do everything we can to protect this untouched gem for many generations to come. Since No current zoning plan is in place for the Island, it is a very good idea to have planning zones and Overlays and it is very important that the Area Plan be a priority for Little Cayman.	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	5-0185		As well as having our own planning board and proper enforcement.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF142	5-0186		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF143	5-0187		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF144	5-0188		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF145	5-0189		Not as pertains to Grand Cayman. But my interest is Little Cayman which is currently a work in progress.	Comment noted.	
FF146	5-0190		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF147	5-0191		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF148	5-0192		We don't want to be part CPA or DCB We need our own plan ,so we can be apply for UNESCO	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers. PlanCayman also proposes separate Area Plans for each of the Sister Islands to meet the particular needs of each of those places. The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF149	5-0193		It is a must that Little Cayman have their own planning board separate from the DCB.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF150	5-0194		A		
FF151	5-0195		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF152	5-0196		How are these going to be enforced?	Once Area Plans have been approved and incorporated into Regulations, the standard Department of Planning Compliance processes will apply.	
FF153	5-0197			No Objection	
FF154	5-0198		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF155	5-0199		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF156	5-0200		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF157	5-0201		Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say '...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...'	Noted, this section can be amended accordingly.	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority <i>and the Board</i> will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located. "
	5-0202		In section 5.7 there is a list of points under 'Environmental Preservation' which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Booby Pond and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. Is it the geological aspect you are trying to draw attention to? If so, there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Perhaps it would be better to say "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands" and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just one example within all three islands, by saying 'such as the Bluff'.	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the <i>Islands</i> Bluff in Cayman-Brac . "
	5-0203		Also in Section 5.7 under 'Coastal Zone Management' there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0204		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say 'such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast'.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0205		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: 'Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.'	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0206		5.3 Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of 'land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent' (page 23).	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land potentially on persons quality of life.	
	5-0207		5.4 Circulation and Transportation – for Little Cayman - encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles. Discourage cars, trucks and speeding.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	5-0208		If Port Zeus adds a ferry, Salt Rocks Dock would need to be adapted for foot passengers, not just for cargo only, and the nearby historic mule pen would need to be preserved. Consider adding a ferry or 'shuttle' concept to flights between the Brac and Little Cayman to reduce the need for moving the airport.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0209		5.5 Infrastructure – on Little Cayman consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island improving cell service to the north side for emergency response. Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc.	Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement sets out the elements of infrastructure that are supported by the Authority and Board. The implementation of individual infrastructure projects is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0210		Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the landfill in Little is minimised.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal <i>and recycling</i> facilities";
	5-0211		5.6 Design – for Little Cayman aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two liveable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency).	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0212		Prohibit container homes.	Issues regarding appropriate and inappropriate building types can be considered during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	5-0213		5.7 Natural resources and coastline – for Little Cayman - seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine appropriate locations for Overlays.	
	5-0214		5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.	
	5-0215		Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands?	The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	5-0216		Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0217		5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation. In Little Cayman minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	5-0218		5.10 Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive and low key: diving, fishing, birdwatching, nature trails. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0219		5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF158	5-0220		Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say ‘...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...’. In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Booby Pond and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. Is it the geological aspect you are trying to draw attention to? If so, there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just one example within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff’. Also in Section 5.7 under ‘Coastal Zone Management’ there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings. Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’. Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: ‘Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.’ 5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications. Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands? Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead 5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	<p>Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.</p> <p>Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.</p> <p>In terms of 5.10, the Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p> <p>In terms of Water Lenses, consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.</p> <p>The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).</p> <p>The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p>	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: <i>"Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman-Brac.</i> "
FF159	5-0221			No Objection	
FF160	5-0222			No Objection	
FF161	5-0223		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF162	5-0224		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF163	5-0225		Section 5.1 needs to reference the DCB. 5.7 should either name and protect specific geological sites for LC as it does for the Bluff in Brac.	<p>Noted, section 5.1 can be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.</p>	<p>Amend section 5.1 as follows: <i>"This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority <u>and the Board</u> will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located. "</i></p> <p>Amend s5.7(5), as follows: <i>"Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman-Brac.</i>"</p>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0226		There is no limit in 5.7 to overall heights of coastal buildings which should be an imperative.	Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights for that area in all zones, and to determine appropriate locations for Overlays.	
	5-0227		5.10, should include that the area plan for each island should address appropriate factors needed to support the economy of each island. Not all the same factors will be relevant to each island.	The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF164	5-0228		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF165	5-0229		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF166	5-0230		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF167	5-0231		5.2 PADs Planned Area Developments should be prohibited on Little Cayman given its very small size. A single large PAD could dominate the entire community and completely alter the character of the island.	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0232		5.3 Subdivision of Land The practice of subdividing undisturbed land in its natural state in the absence of any consideration of need is a waste of natural capital. Facilitating the practice of purely speculative real estate activity provides little benefit to the local community and breeds shady actors and often fraudulent enterprises. This is particularly acute in the Sister Islands. The CPA and DCB must include genuine need for subdivision lots based on inventory and the market and must differentiate cleared or disturbed land from natural undisturbed land setting a much higher bar for approval.	If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	5-0233		5.4 Circulation and Transportation It is clear that the 1997 Plan, planning processes, and government policy has completely failed in respect to ground transportation on Grand Cayman. The section outlines more of the same. It is difficult to understand how things will improve carrying on the same practices as now. A fundamental, paradigm change in automobile transportation is required.	The Planning Statement includes a number of approaches relating to ground transportation, such as supporting alternative forms of transportation, promoting walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4, and encouraging mixed use development.	
FF168	5-0234			No Objection	
FF169	5-0235			No Objection	
FF170	5-0236			No Objection	
FF171	5-0237			No Objection	
FF172	5-0238		On the matter of creating safe infrastructure to encourage usage of active transit (bicycles, walkability etc) A suggestion I would make is to look up the conditions necessary for a 'complete street': https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Complete_streets#:~:text=Complete%20streets%20is%20a%20transportation,of%20their%20mode%20of%20transportation. Please also see the Amplify Cayman presentation on the Incorporation of Green Spaces into Urban Design: https://www.amplifycayman.com/_files/ugd/76de65_48e545b948b146e78d3812cf4f230a74.pdf The nationwide development of these will negate the need for continued car infrastructure development and will encourage people in Cayman to take healthier alternative modes of transit such as walking or biking. Application of appropriate coastal set backs has long been ignored by this department. What will the department consider as appropriate?	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented cities and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability, promoting alternate forms of transportation as highlighted in Sections 3.7.4(i) and 5.4.7 of the Planning Statement.	
FF173	5-0239		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF174	5-0240			No Objection	
FF175	5-0241		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF176	5-0242		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF177	5-0243		Page 23 PADs and subdivisions etc. should include the provisions for sidewalks; look at the mess of Frank Hall homes in West Bay! It's supposed to be a community and you can't even walk safely in there!	Noted. Sidewalks are not typically required for subdivisions. The NRA has Subdivision Regulations which include sidewalks and any policies that are considered appropriate to support this in different neighbourhoods can be considered within Area Plans.	Consider Sidewalks in Subdivisions in each Area Plan (consider whether suitable in different zones)
	5-0244		Page 24 5.4 Shared parking and multi story parking lots need stricter consideration/implementation (for example at the airport long-term parking, why can we ask Uncle Dart for his CB parking garage drawings and replicate it? Oh wait never mind, we might have to move the whole thing after elections!)	Shared parking arrangements would be a matter for landowners to negotiate but the Development and Planning Regulations require the submission of Parking Management Strategies for General Commercial, Neighbourhood Commercial and Hotel/Tourism Zones. Consideration could be given to extending this to other zones.	None
	5-0245		What are the alternative transportation modes referred to in #4?	Alternative transportation modes include vehicles, EVs, bicycles, scooters etc. It is not considered necessary to list these since new alternative modes may come forward in future. Please note, this section is suggested for amendment to refer to EVs.	Amend section 5.4 as follows: "Parking Standards 3. Apply parking requirements that appropriately address diverse land uses, unique traffic characteristics and demands; 4. Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes <u>including facilities and infrastructure for Electric Vehicles ;"</u>
	5-0246		Page 25 5.5 How can we build infrastructure without guidelines for population growth?	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0247		Why is there still no stormwater and drain management plan after 30 years?	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0248		What water conservation practices will be encouraged?	The National Planning Framework makes reference to individual water harvesting and using treated grey water for irrigation. It is not considered necessary to list all water conservation practices since alternatives may come forward in future.	
FF178	5-0249		See general feedback and comments (rather than specific objections)	Noted	
FF179	5-0250			No Objection	
FF180	5-0251		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF181	5-0252		Drafting comment: Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say ‘...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...’. In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman’s Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.’	Sections 5.1 and 5.7 can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority and the Board will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located." Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff-in-Cayman-Brac ."
	5-0253		Also in Section 5.7 under ‘Coastal Zone Management’ there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Building heights will be addressed in each Area Plan	
	5-0254		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’.	Building heights will be addressed in each Area Plan	
	5-0255		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: ‘Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands.	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0256		The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.”	Noted	
	5-0257		General comments: 5.2 PADs -inappropriate for Little Cayman given Little Cayman's needs and goals.	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0258		5.3 Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of ‘land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent’ (page 23).	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land potentially on persons quality of life	
	5-0259		5.4 Circulation and Transportation – encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles. Discourage cars, trucks and speeding. This is already supported by the current maximum speed limit on Little Cayman (25), which serves the island's sensitive endemic species like the Sister Islands Rock Iguana and should remain.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	5-0260		If Port Zeus adds a ferry, Salt Rocks Dock would need to be adapted for foot passengers, not just for cargo only, and the nearby historic mule pen would need to be preserved. Consider adding a ferry or ‘shuttle’ concept to flights between the Brac and Little Cayman to reduce the need for moving the airport.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0261		5.5 Infrastructure – consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island improving cell service to the north side for emergency response.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0262		Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc. Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the landfill in Little is minimised.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal and recycling facilities";
	5-0263		5.6 Design – aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two habitable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency). Prohibit container homes.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	5-0264		5.7 Natural resources and coastline – seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine appropriate locations for Overlays.	
	5-0265		5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.	
	5-0266		Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands?	The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	5-0267		Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0268		5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation for features not requested by the local Little Cayman population. In Little Cayman minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	5-0269		5.10 Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive, low volume, and low key: diving, fishing, birdwatching, nature trails. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0270		5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF182	5-0271		Page 23 Drafting comment: Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. I would suggest amending this section to say ‘...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...’.	Section 5.1 can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority and the Board will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located."
	5-0272		General comment: section 5.3, subdivisions, Little Cayman in particular has suffered from clearcutting of land on which nothing is then built. No such cutting should be allowed without planning permission of specific structures requiring clearing.	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission.	
	5-0273		General comment: Section 5.5, infrastructure: much of the currently proposed development on Little Cayman would exceed the technical capacity of the infrastructure of the island, be it in terms of sewage treatment, water availability, road capacity and structural capability, and power supply.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
	5-0274		General comment: Section 5.7, Natural Resources: Much of the proposed development on Little Cayman is designed with no thought to the considerations discussed in this section.	Outside the remit if the Planning Statement.	
	5-0275		More comments were made elsewhere; in summary the natural resources and environment of Little Cayman are what make it special for the residents and the economic magnet it is for the Cayman Island as a whole.	An updated development plan is long overdue. For this reason we are currently undergoing the process to have an updated plan that will reflect the needs of the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0276		Drafting comment: Page 27 In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like an omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.’	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the <u>Islands</u> Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
	5-0277		Drafting Comment: Page 27 Costal Zone Management Bullet #12 There is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0278		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
FF183	5-0280		As for Goal 5.1 that reviews the use of land properties on 7 mile beach it is not useful to only reach out to business owners, and those affected by 7 mile beach as this includes not only investors into 7 mile beach who are benefiting from development space more specifically over development it only reaches out to those who might only live there sometimes of the year it should also be noted that should be 7 mile development plan be supported and enacted it does not consider the use of public beaches that are now being threatened. A prime example, being Hotel Indigo, as well as the Kimpton that have both taken up parts of the public beach that has been around for decades, and slowly, we are seeing the degradation of public use for beaches that are rightfully used for Caymanians.	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0281		And it should also be noted that should the 7 mile development plan be enacted and supersedes any other legislation this is clearly a breach of not only due process, but complete ignorance to the legislation that are MPs have worked so hard to clarify.	The Planning Statement has been prepared to establish a legal basis for the preparation of Area Plans.	
FF184	5-0282		PADs are inappropriate for Little Cayman given its specific needs and goals.	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF185	5-0283		Drafting comment: Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say ‘...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...’.	Section 5.1 can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority and the Board will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located."
	5-0284		In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.’	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
	5-0285		Also in Section 5.7 under ‘Coastal Zone Management’ there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0286		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0287		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: ‘Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.’	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF186	5-0288		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF187	5-0289		PADs - Should are not appropriate for Little.	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0290		Subdivisions – There are over 1400 vacant subdivision lots already on Little Cayman.	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is	
	5-0291		There should be an immediate moratorium on additional subdivisions being permitted until the many pressing issues (A Little Cayman specific Development Plan, a Little Cayman specific planning board with Little Cayman representation, infrastructure issues, the airport discussion etc) are addressed and legislated.		
	5-0292		Circulation and Transportation – Electric Vehicles should be required for all private residents. And strict speed limit controls are needed not just for the safety of walkers and bikers on our sidewalk free roads, but for the preservation of our endangered Sister Islands Rock Iguana (SIRI). Nearly 40 SIRI have already been killed (that we know of) on Little Caymans roads so far this year.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	5-0293		Infrastructure – The infrastructure issues on Little Cayman are different from, but just as large as, the issues on Grand Cayman.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
	5-0294		Water lens use and protection, waste management, recycling, invasive species management, roads, energy and marine protections all need a new look and serious management.	Noted. The Planning Statement includes policies on all of these issues and the role of each Area Plan is to determine any more specific and detailed policies that may be required for each area to better serve those places.	
	5-0295		Design – 3 story buildings should be the maximum height (35 feet) with a maximum of 2 living stories. All building designs should be in keeping with island culture and aesthetics.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0296		Natural resources and coastline – This section should be expanded beyond “The Bluff” and should include Bloody Bay Marine Park, The Booby Pond, Owen Island (that should be purchased and turned into a national park), Tarpon Lake, South Hole Sound, Point of Sand etc should be included.	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
	5-0297		Water lenses – Need to be protected and managed. Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Nature Trails and public spaces are critical for any thriving community.	Noted. The Planning Statement includes policies on all of these issues and the role of each Area Plan is to determine any more specific and detailed policies that may be required for each area to better serve those places.	
	5-0298		Economy – Page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial to thrive. This is only appropriate for Grand. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive and low key. Diving, fishing, birdwatching, nature trails. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry by itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF188	5-0299		1. Will SWM be incorporated on the area plans or as part of the overall statement?	Infrastructure will form part of the considerations for each Area Plan. The draft Planning Statement supports long-range plans for a holistic stormwater Management Plan and seeks to ensure adequate stormwater infrastructure and design standards, as highlighted in Section 5.5. We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0300		2. How will LPP requirements not only be enforced but how will these sites be made to be more functional for users as a lot of developers us the leftover tidbits of land that are not developable and make it the LPP?	The Planning Statement acknowledges the need to better utilise LPP properties. The mechanism for enforcing this is yet to be determined, but recreation / open space needs of each community could be identified as part of Area Plan preparation. Regulations would need to be amended to support this policy approach.	
FF189	5-0301		In relation to Little Cayman - PAD's are not applicable.	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0302		Subdivision of land - no more sub-divisions, as there are so many undeveloped sub-divisions, that we do not want to over-populate the island with lots of small house lots.	If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	5-0303		Circulation and transportation - Please complete paving the Northern Coastal Road. Possibly a couple of more rental cars, especially at popular periods, such as Easter.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	5-0304		Most low-density tourist accomodation have a shuttle bus to and from the airport, and bicycles on site to use.	The Planning Statement supports existing and future public transport operations and seeks to ensure adequate and safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The operation of tourist accommodation is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0305		Infrastructure - keep buildings to no more than two floors of living space - can be built on top of part-above-ground cisterns; or stilts; this will relate to private homes as well as tourist accomodation. Better internet service to be provided by FLOW, Digicel or any other communications service provider.	Building heights will be addressed at the Area Plan phase. While the provision of internet service is outside the scope of the Planning Statement, the draft document does 'support the provision of the latest communication technology for residents and businesses'.	
FF190	5-0306		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF191	5-0307		Again, I suggest that wording be added to the effect that the considerations for Grand Cayman my not in fact apply to the Sister Islands, and that really each island is deserving of its individual plans.	Section 1.4 of the draft Planning Statement indicates that a key aspect of the structure of the Plan is the introduction of Area Plans, which provide a mechanism to implement national objectives and policies in a manner that is applicable to individual locations.	
FF192	5-0308		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF193	5-0309			No Objection	
FF194	5-0310		5.4 Little Cayman should transition to bikes, e-bikes, electric cars.	Noted. The Planning Statement supports the use of alternative transportation modes and encourages conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel. More specific policies to achieve this in Little Cayman can be considered at the Area Plan stage.	
	5-0311		5.5 Little Cayman must stop approving development until a wastewater plan is in place	Wastewater treatment requirements are determined by the Water Authority through consultation of development applications. The Planning Statement encourages the implementation of the latest technologies to minimise the environmental impact of wastewater treatment practices (section 5.5(6)). A reference to supporting long-range plans for wastewater treatment can be added to section 5.5	Amend section 5.5, to include the following additional bullet point: <i>Wastewater</i> <i>- Support long-range plans for future wastewater treatment facilities;</i>
	5-0312		5.7 needs clarification #5 (page27) needs to include all geological features on Little Cayman. Additionally, Little should include the importance of beach and shoreline clean up to keep Little Cayman beautiful	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically. More specific locations / requirements will be considered at the Area Plan stage.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: <i>"Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Bree. "</i>
	5-0313		General Comments that changing building technology for new construction is really not much more expensive, it is retrofitting that is. So new construction building codes might be considered different than existing structures.	Noted. Building Codes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0314		Also, dark skies would be huge and people have all ready been visiting Little Cayman do to it's low light pollution. The cost to keep it low or improve is almost nothing going forward.	Noted. Section 5.5 is proposed to be amended. Any more specific approaches to street lighting in Little Cayman that would be needed to support this can be considered in the Area Plan.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <i>"Electricity and Street Lighting</i> <i>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</i> <i>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</i> <i>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</i>
	5-0315		Signage: I really think on Little Cayman creating a simple, very natural signage program would be terrific. The church just installed the first sign that looks like Miami Beach and not Little Cayman. Just wooden signs with a similar feel could help set a tone for the feel and uniqueness of the island. It there is lighting, it would have to be dark sky designed and not pollute the area around it.	Agreed. Section 5.6(9) of the draft Planning Statement notes the need to apply design standards for commercial and wayfinding signage. This can be considered in the Little Cayman Area Plan.	
	5-0316		Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say '...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...'. '.	Section 5.1 can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority <i>and the Board</i> will apply in respect of other considerations, irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located."

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF195	5-0317		In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.’	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff-in-Cayman-Brac ."
	5-0318		Also in Section 5.7 under ‘Coastal Zone Management’ there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0319		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’.	Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	5-0320		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: ‘Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.’	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0321		General comments: 5.2 PADs -inappropriate for Little Cayman given Little Cayman's needs and goals.	These types of concerns will be dealt with at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process where the people of the Cayman Island through collaboration with DoP will determine the zoning and character of the indicative areas	
	5-0322		5.3 Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of ‘land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent’ (page 23).	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land potentially on persons quality of life.	
	5-0323		5.4 Circulation and Transportation – encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles. Discourage cars, trucks and speeding. This is already supported by the current maximum speed limit on Little Cayman (25), which serves the island’s sensitive endemic species like the Sister Islands Rock Iguana and should remain.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	5-0324		If Port Zeus adds a ferry, Salt Rocks Dock would need to be adapted for foot passengers, not just for cargo only, and the nearby historic mule pen would need to be preserved. Consider adding a ferry or ‘shuttle’ concept to flights between the Brac and Little Cayman to reduce the need for moving the airport.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0325		5.5 Infrastructure – consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island improving cell service to the north side for emergency response.	Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement sets out the elements of infrastructure that are supported by the Authority and Board. The implementation of individual infrastructure projects is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0326		Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc. Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the landfill in Little is minimised.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal <u>and recycling</u> facilities";
	5-0327		5.6 Design – aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two habitable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency).	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	5-0328		Prohibit container homes.	Issues regarding appropriate and inappropriate building types can be considered during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	5-0329		5.7 Natural resources and coastline – seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine appropriate locations for Overlays.	
	5-0330		5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.	
	5-0331		Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands? Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	5-0332		5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation for features not requested by the local Little Cayman population. In Little Cayman minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0333		5.10 Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive, low volume, and low key: diving, fishing, birdwatching, nature trails. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0334		5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF196	5-0335		This section omits reference to important areas of Little Cayman such as Sesuvium Marsh, the Bloody Bay Marine Park, Owen Island, the Booby Pond etc. The Bluff in the Brac should be just one of several examples listed in this section.	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
FF197	5-0336		I noticed that in section 5.7, the Environmental Preservation section, there is a specific mention of the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. While I understand the importance of the Bluff, I believe it would be beneficial to also consider including other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island. Additionally, I suggest considering a more inclusive statement that emphasizes preserving the unique geological characteristics of all the islands, or at the very least, mentioning some examples from all three islands, such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman. Thank you for considering this suggestion.	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
FF198	5-0337		Transportation (page 24): I object to the free-for-all road, corridor and parking lot development due to its statistically proved outcomes that the aforementioned will pose greater traffic challenges and congestion on our roads. Fully functional public transportation networks are pivotal to the sustainability and quality of life for those living in the Cayman Islands. Public transportation improvements should be the only agenda item of the Cayman Islands Government to curtail the sprawling effects of unregulated development and population increase predicted.	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability, promoting alternate forms of transportation and on street parking as highlighted in Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement. However, completing a transportation plan is outside the remit of the Planning Statement but the statement is flexible enough to support these policies when they are brought forward.	
FF199	5-0338		No Objection		
FF200	5-0339		While there are no objections to the composition of the 5.0 Other Policy Considerations and their requirements, it will always depend on the manner in which the Authority ultimately will apply the policies that may give rise to concerns and far-reaching problems. It is recognized that there may often be potential for the Authority's manner of applying certain the provisions may result in an imbalance in decisions that will have negative impacts that could possibly have been avoided if there were more careful consideration so as to avoid the trap of different strokes for different folks. Just a few examples where potential problems may arise: "5.3 SUBDIVISION OF LAND which states, inter alia, that "Land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission for development on those parcels."	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. A key aspect of the Area Plan approach is that it gives the community greater input into defining the restrictions within each zone and provide more information and evidence to decision-makers.	
	5-0340		5.4 CIRCULATION AND TRANSPORTATION ...the never-ending building of roads will never cease until the CIG bravely grabs the bull by the horns and enact laws to control the rampant importation of vehicles by every Tom, Dick and Harry who has access to the Internet; in addition in order for one to import vehicles, an application for permission to do so has to be made, and which may or may not be granted - I have heard that Singapore uses this method to control the purchase of vehicles.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0341		5.7 NATURAL RESOURCES AND COASTLINE - it is crucial to treat just about every iota of this with due care and attention for the well-being of everyone	Noted. Area Plans provide an opportunity for more detailed consideration of all policies outlined in the Planning Statement.	
	5-0342		5.8 WATER LENSES - the opening sentence "Freshwater lenses contribute to the health of the overlying environment and are vital sources of water for agriculture, horticulture and as an emergency potable water source." - puts it in a nutshell the importance of protecting them, but attention must be paid to the entire contents.	Noted.	
	5-0343		5.10 ECONOMY - "Supporting Cayman's economic sectors is essential to maintaining high quality of life standards. The Authority will therefore seek to ensure that the finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries continue to develop and thrive." While the importance of a healthy economy is encapsulated in these two sentences, it will be worse than short-sighted for CIG to continue to measure everything by the bottom line, because this does not necessarily equate to a good and fair quality of life for all.	Noted. The Planning Statement identifies that a balance is required between different activities and competing uses of land.	
FF201	5-0344		Page 23 – 5.3 Sub Division of Land Again – a comment – not an objection. I was very happy to hear at one of your meetings that you “have created mechanisms by which we can create affordable housing units that allow those lot sizes to be reduced down to 6,500.” It would be great if that decision could be fast-tracked so that developers and contractors can very soon start building affordable houses for people in the lower income bracket. Everyone aspires to own their own home and Government should allow them an opportunity to do so.	Noted. The approval process is outside the scope of the Planning Statement, however the Department / Authority will seek to implement Affordable Housing solutions recommended by the Ministry's Affordable Housing Plan, where appropriate.	
	5-0345		What about getting big developers to give land to Government for critical habitats for the human species instead of other species!	The suggested approach is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. However, the introduction of the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (NRPO) in section 4.2 seeks to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and in certain cases may recommend elements of the Overlay to be protected from development.	
FF202	5-0346		No Objection		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF203	5-0347		5.2 we do not want any PADS of development on Cayman Brac unless it is a Natural reserve	This will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0348		5.7 Nature preserve such as a Cayman Islands National preserve at the eastern tip of Cayman Brac. Such as the lighthouse plateau thatch walk on top of bluff and the keys (Longbeach etc) on north and Southside low lands of Cayman Brac.	The designation of a Nature Preserve is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. Protected Areas processes are under the remit of the National Conservation Act.	
FF204	5-0349		In section 5.7 there is a list of points under ‘Environmental Preservation’ which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say “Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands” and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying ‘such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.’	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
	5-0350		Also in Section 5.7 under ‘Coastal Zone Management’ there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings.	Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in all zones.	
	5-0351		Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say ‘such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast’.	Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in all zones.	
	5-0352		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: ‘Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.’	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF205	5-0353		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF206	5-0354		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF207	5-0355		The environmental preservation policy should be amended to remove ANY wiggle room or flexibility from government officials in the impact of development on the natural environment.	Area Plans provide an opportunity to establish more detailed environmental policies for each area, providing more information and evidence for decision-makers.	
	5-0356		Money gets anyone to decide in ways that nature cannot protect itself against. Really, like the unborn baby being aborted, nature needs strict and unchangeable protection against decisions driven by human greed. Once a piece of land is threatened by development, there should be no way money can lift protections that are in place. If we let developers and real estate investors/speculators have even a tiny opening to change protections or zoning, the pressure money creates, not to mention corruption leaves nature exposed to human destruction.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; “ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.	
FF208	5-0357		I agree with these policies, but we need to address growth management. The current level of runaway development in Grand Cayman is not sustainable and it will be impossible to achieve the 6 strategic objectives in section 1 if we do not address growth management	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF209	5-0358		No Objection		
FF210	5-0359		5.3 Subvision of Land (p.23); The Government should not encourage the subvision of land for smaller house lots to accommodate the artificial population growth. Caymanians have a way of life that came to be from traditions and values passed on through generations. Therefore Caymanians should not lose their right to pursue a lifestyle of their ancestors that is hindered by the 'need to accommodate a growing population of imported labour'. How is it fair to a Caymanian to lose their ability to acquire land build a home to their standards at the expense of accommodating strangers who as a majority do not care for the Caymanian people, the environment and preservation of the cultural heritage of the islands and are only here on a temporary basis for their own benefit to make a financial gain and in some instances steel from the people of the Cayman Islands.	The draft Planning Statement introduces an Estate Residential zone (section 3.3) that addresses the need for large-lot single-family residences typically located outside of urban areas.	
FF211	5-0360		No Objection		
FF212	5-0361		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	5-0362		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF214	5-0363		No Objection		
FF215	5-0364		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	5-0365		Again, how is this going to be enforced?	Once Area Plans have been approved and incorporated into Regulations, the standard Department of Planning Compliance processes will apply.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF217	5-0366		5.4- should include "green belt or bridge" for areas that can be used for animals to migrate or disperse and access other areas of the island safely like breeding grounds for blue iguanas and crabs.	The proposed NRPO is responsible for identifying important ecosystems which will provide addition considerations for development. As indicated in section 4.2, in certain instances some elements of the Overlay may be recommended for protection from development.	
	5-0367		5.5- should include footpaths, sidewalks and bike lanes... we need more than just roads! Children should be able to safely walk to school, but the schools are not accessible to residential areas via sidewalks or wide enough bike lanes! There should be a network of trails, footpaths or bike lanes!	The Planning Statement seeks to "Ensure adequate and safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; Encourage conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel", in Section 5.4.6 and 5.4.7.	
FF218	5-0368			No Objection	
FF219	5-0369		The transportation section is incredibly vague. I get that you are not the roads authority, but just like the DoE should have been consulted to provide the framework for the conservation aspects of this plan, perhaps the roads authority could have been consulted?? "5. Support existing and future public transport operations;" HOW? What about making recommendations on future public transport recommendations? There needs to be a greater commitment to inter-departmental collaboration on something like this. You are coming to the people - lay persons who know nothing about any of these things - yet you neglect to involve our own experts in these decisions? This makes zero sense.	<p>The draft Planning Statement introduces broad policies which have drafted with reference to the National Planning Framework document. (NPF). The NPF document was previously prepared in consultation with government departments, agencies and the wider public.</p> <p>More specific policies for transportation will be considered within each Area Plan.</p> <p>Inter-departmental corporation occurs on a range of projects, including the Transport Working Group, which is led by Ministry PAHITD.</p>	
	5-0370		Wetland habitats are an ongoing concern for airport expansion yet no mention.	Airport expansion / relocation is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping airports at any given location. It is anticipated that these projects would also be subject to EIA processes, which are separate to the Development Plan review.	
	5-0371		In fact, what does get mentioned several times is the exploding population growth yet there are no recommendations for if we should control this to facilitate a more natural pace of development?	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	5-0372		I simply can't understand how this document notes so many important issues but fails to say anything significant about any of them.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to set out proposed Planning Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations. More in-depth policy initiatives will be addressed in each Area Plan.	
FF220	5-0373		My concern is that it needs to be explicit in the Policy statement that there will be a Committee predominantly of suitably experienced / competent persons from the Area, who will make the decisions on the Area Plans. And ideally, those persons should be appointed by voting of the people who are living in that Area.	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
FF221	5-0374		Infrastructure include transport infrastructure which consists in fixed installations such as roads, waterways, airways and terminals such as airports, bus stations, ports etc with all the related facilities - why is Circulation and transportation being presented as a separate policy consideration from Infrastructure?	Noted. The overlap between these two policy areas is recognised. However Circulation and Transportation relates to the movement of people and goods, whereas 'Infrastructure' relates to a wide range of services that support quality of life. Regardless of the formatting, section 5.1 indicates that the Authority / Board will apply all of these considerations set out in section 5.	
	5-0375		Wo are the parties involved in defining and enforcing the standards mentioned in the report? Which are the competent departments or statutory authorities that can validate and ensure an appropriate definition of these policies and their enforcement.	All relevant government departments / agencies and external utility providers will be involved in all stages of the Development Plan review to define standards where necessary. Full consultation will also take place at each stage of the Plan Review to ensure that policies represent the needs of the community.	
FF222	5-0376		PADs should have more restrictive zoning specifications to better manage the provision of sustainable infrastructure	Section 5.2 of the Planning Statement states "The Authority shall apply the Planned Area Development policies, and other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, to allow for high-quality, mixed-use developments that are compatible with the surrounding area. The Authority may require natural buffers and/or transitional massing and scale at site peripheries in order to ensure that proposed PAD developments do not adversely affect the character and value of surrounding land uses."	
	5-0377		and have less impact on property costs of neighboring affected areas.		
FF223	5-0378			No Objection	
FF224	5-0379		page 23, Subdivision. Long agricultural roads in the eastern districts should be 55 to sixty feet wide to accommodate future growth and development.	Section 5.4(2) of the Planning Statement indicates that long-range plans a safe and efficient network of roads will be supported. While the NRA is responsible for stipulating and adjusting road width requirements, there is an opportunity in each Area Plan to consider appropriate locations for new / amended road corridors.	
	5-0380		page 25, Infrastructure. provisions should be made for waste management in the eastern districts.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan. The role of the Development Plan is to support long-range waste management plans and ensure compatible land uses.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0381		page 28, Water Lenses. Policy and provision must be made to protect the eastern water lenses.	Noted. The policies to protect Water Lenses are set out in section 5.8.	
WR1-A	5-0382			No Objection	
WR1-B	5-0383		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR2	5-0384		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR3	5-0385		Section 5, Other Considerations: section 5.3, subdivisions, Little Cayman in particular has suffered from clearcutting of land on which nothing is then built. No such cutting should be allowed without planning permission of specific structures requiring clearing. Section 5.5, infrastructure: much of the proposed development on Little Cayman would exceed the technical capacity of the infrastructure of the island, be it in terms of sewage treatment, water availability, road capacity and structural capability, and power supply. Specifically with regard to roads, it is ridiculous that most of the roads are paved using “tar patch”, which degrades within a couple of years. If the roads were altered to include “traffic calming” techniques widely used in other countries (zig-zags, narrow sections, speed bumps and other techniques to reduce speed) protection of wildlife on Little Cayman would be enhanced without the need to post traffic enforcement officers widely. Section 5.7, Natural Resources: Much of the proposed development on Little Cayman is designed with no thought to the considerations discussed in this section. More comments were made elsewhere; in summary the natural resources and environment of Little Cayman are what make it special for the residents and the economic magnet it is for the Cayman Island as a whole.	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers. Noted regarding the unique values of Little Cayman. The role of the Planning Statement is to define the various Zones, Overlays and broad Policies, which will be applied in more detail within each Area Plan.	
	5-0386	5.2 Planned Area Developments (PADs)	PADs should not be allowed at all on Little Cayman. LC is too small to accommodate them.	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0387	5.3 Subdivision of Land	For many years LC has been plagued by developers wanting to create subdivisions, even when there is no need for them. This has resulted in miles of roads to nowhere with no buildings anywhere near them. They are ugly scars across the island. Many are decades old. The continued unnecessary subdivision of LC should be stopped. Stricter considerations to determine whether these subdivisions are really needed should be applied	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	5-0388		Significant land clearing was necessary to build these roads. As the DOE has explained many times, building a road disrupts wildlife habitat. Land clearing before any building permits have been issued should be stopped. Currently many developers and property owners clear their land for roads and other reasons before even applying for a development permit. Then they apply for permission retroactively, after the damage is done. There should be significant penalties for clearing land without permission and there should be no retroactive permission for having done so.	Provisions for After-the-fact planning approvals and penalties are set in Regulations, and outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0389		Applications for subdivision of land on LC should be given a higher level of scrutiny to determine if they are needed. No land should be cleared until a permit for constructing buildings is issued. Penalties should be levied for clearing land or developing without a permit. There should be no retroactive permission to clear land or otherwise develop property.	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan. Provisions for After-the-fact planning approvals and penalties are set in Regulations, and outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0390	5.4 Circulation and Transportation	All paved roads on LC are paved with the “chip and tar” method. Such roads are easily damaged by use, weather, and climate. The solution has been to fill the potholes with sand gravel or just ignore the problems. Roads that are sometimes maintained are primarily at the western end of the island. The LC roads are in terrible condition, particularly at the east end of the island, and are not regularly maintained. All paved LC roads should be paved with asphalt or some equally durable compound and regularly maintained.	Road construction and maintenance is under the remit of the National Roads Authority.	
	5-0391		One of the major north-south crossroads that connects to the ring road circling the island ends in 300-meter-long unpaved section of the ring road. This same unpaved section connects to the north coast boat ramp and several homes and should be paved at least past the western end of the crossroad. This is a major thoroughfare on LC	Road construction and maintenance is under the remit of the National Roads Authority.	
	5-0392		LC roads should be paved and repaired with asphalt. LC roads should be regularly inspected and repaired. The ring road on the north side of LC should be paved from the west end of the crossroad (“Ken Hall Road”) eastward past the boat ramp and homes to meet with previously paved road surface (~300 meters).	Road construction and maintenance is under the remit of the National Roads Authority.	
	5-0393		Many meetings have been held over the years to discuss solid waste management on LC, but nothing has been done about it. An appropriate solid waste management plan must be approved and put in place. It should include facilities for recycling glass, aluminum, paper, cardboard, batteries, styrofoam and for safe disposal of hazardous waste materials.	Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers. A reference to recycling facilities is proposed for section 5.5	Amend s.5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal facilities , <u>including recycling and composting facilities</u> ;"
	5-0394		Sewage is treated by septic tanks on LC. The size of the island will limit the number and size of septic tanks in the future. Depth and placement must be regulated to prevent contamination of sea and fresh water.	Section 5.5(5) of the Planning Statement acknowledges the need for alternatives to individual septic tanks.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR4	5-0395	5.5 Infrastructure	Potable water is provided on LC via rainwater collected in cisterns or by reverse osmosis of sea water. All applications for development permits should include an appropriate means to provide potable water.	Section 5.5(10) of the Planning Statement encourages the use of water conservation practices and alternative water sources.	
	5-0396		The Sister Islands Electric company should be encouraged and assisted to install a solar electric system for the entire island, including feedback from solar systems into the generator grid to help lower electricity costs.	The operation of the Sister Islands Electric Company is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. However section 5.5(12) supports the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources.	
	5-0397		Only turtle-friendly street lighting should be installed anywhere lighting is desired. Property owners who do not want street lighting by their home should not be required to have it.	Noted, in consultation with relevant infrastructure providers, it is suggested to amend section 5.5 to minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure. Appropriate locations for turtle-friendly lighting are determined in consultation with DoE for individual applications.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> <u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u> <u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u> <u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>
	5-0398		Communication and transparency are not favored by the CI government, especially on LC. Many public meetings have been held on LC that were poorly attended because no one knew about them. Currently there is an LC Facebook page, but many people do not use and do not wish to use Facebook. They should still be able to receive information. A notification system should be established for the island. An LC webpage would be ideal, if it is set up and maintained by a paid, experienced professional. The webpage could be used to post LC planning applications for development permits so all residents could read them, not just adjacent property owners. Notices of public meetings, hurricane and storm warnings, planned power outages, opening hours for LC businesses, etc. could be posted on the site. Lost and found and items for sale sections could also be included.	Notification processes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, alternative methods to engage with the community during each phase of the Development Plan review will be considered.	
	5-0399		The small population on Little Cayman needs to be limited to match the capacity of the island, but this does limit the availability and variety of goods and services. LC has one grocery store, one place to buy gasoline, one liquor store, and one airline to serve it. These entities essentially have monopolies on their goods and services and prices are much higher on LC than on GC. Efforts should be made to either provide competition or find another way to bring LC prices for necessities into line with GC prices. A second, larger and more diverse grocery store would be a good start.	Many of these issues are outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The Little Cayman Area Plan however will provide an opportunity to define commercial zones on the island if considered necessary by the community.	
	5-0400	5.6 Design	To date nothing has been done about “design” on LC. Many residents (perhaps most) particularly do not want to have any type of container home on the island. GC has already banned them as unsuitable habitation and LC does not want them for the same reasons. They do not meet the building code and are unnecessary. Properly built homes or apartments can be provided instead if necessary	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	5-0401		Container homes should be banned on LC in perpetuity.	Issues regarding appropriate and inappropriate building types can be considered during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	5-0402	5.7 Natural Resources and Coastline	Views of the coast should not be blocked by buildings. Building height regulations, setbacks, and spacing distances between homes should be set to prevent this.	Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights and setbacks in all zones.	
	5-0403	5.8 Water Lenses	I do not have enough knowledge of water lenses to make a comment.	Noted	
	5-0404	5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space	The small size of LC makes it less urgent to plan space usage ahead of time. When a particular need for a park or recreation facility is brought up, it can be communicated to the island residents for discussion and a decision.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	5-0405	5.10 Economy	“The global ecotourism market size was valued at USD 216.49 billion in 2023 and is projected to grow from USD 260.76 billion in 2024 to USD 759.93 billion by 2032...” (https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/ecotourism-market-108700). LC provides a unique natural environment, as described above, which attracts ecotourists. Destroying this environment through overdevelopment will have a significantly negative effect on the Cayman Islands economy due to the loss of lucrative nature tourism.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; “ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.	
WR5	5-0406			No Objection	
WR6	5-0407			No Objection	
WR7	5-0408			No Objection	
WR8	5-0409			No Objection	
WR9	5-0410			No Objection	
WR10	5-0411			No Objection	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR11	5-0412		To help the CPA with its decision making, the body should be bound to have its decisions being data-driven and not simply reliant on arguments raised by objectors, which are often emotive and not based on quantitative data. There should be the inclusion of greater detail, including transparent criteria to measure compliance for each of the considerations listed in Section 5.	Noted. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas (Section 1.4) in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. It is the intention that Area Plans will be drafted based on all available data. A key aspect of the Area Plan approach is that it gives the community greater input into defining the restrictions within each zone and provide more information and evidence to decision-makers.	
	5-0413	5.2 Planned Area Developments (PADs)	We note that the Planning Statement includes a section, albeit a brief one, on Planned Area Developments (PADs) that provide for a mix of land uses, densities and open spaces. As evidenced by our flagship development at Camana Bay, this level of master-planning takes a multi-decade approach and aims to balance economic, social and environmental interests, allowing provisions to be adapted to meet changing needs, if required. Noting that the National Conservation Act delegates responsibility for Environmental Impact Assessments to the National Conservation Council, the Planning Statement should articulate how PAD regulations will facilitate coordination across government agencies.	Development projects (including PADs) are referred to relevant government agencies under s.7 of the Development and Planning Act for feedback prior to a decision being made from the Authority/Board.	
	5-0414	5.4 Circulation and Transportation	Point #12 states: "Ensure that developments in the area surrounding airport lands do not impose a detrimental impact on airport operations." It is our recommendation to replace the use of "airport" with "aviation" - as aviation facilities is a broader term that can include heliports, vertiports or any facilities of this nature.	Noted, this section can be amended accordingly.	Amend s.5.4(11 and 12), as follows: <i>11. Support the long-range needs and alternatives for all types of airport- aviation facilities throughout the Cayman Islands; and</i> <i>12. Ensure that developments in the area surrounding airport lands do not impose a detrimental impact on airport aviation operations. "</i>
	5-0415	5.5 Infrastructure	The Stormwater and Drainage section (#7) indicates "Support long-range plans for a holistic stormwater Management Plan." It would be helpful to identify which entity/entities will be tasked with developing these plans. It is important to note that such solutions will require public investment along with that of future developers, for example: Raleigh Gardens, South Sound basin, etc.	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study led by NRA / Ministry PAHITD which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0416	5.7 Natural Resources and Coastline	The commitment expressed to "Apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions " is vague. It would be helpful to understand where the CPA will obtain the necessary data to support changes to coastal setbacks. To ensure transparency, this data should be available to the public.	In 2021 Cabinet granted approval for a Government Technical Working Group to investigate the establishment of a Coastal Setback Reference Line for coastlines in the Cayman Islands. This will be determined through historical aerial imagery and the complementary development of a Coastal Category Setback map that considers shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations. Once these setbacks have been determined it is anticipated that they would be made available to the public.	
	5-0417	5.10 Economy	It would be helpful if clarity is provided on how the CPA will determine whether a retail development might "adversely affect the vitality and visibility of other shopping centres." Will there be a common approach/study methodology that all developers should follow?	Where appropriate Area Plans may include some criteria / methodology to consider the impact of retail developments on existing centres. It is anticipated this would only be necessary in Areas where existing centres have value to the community. This will be determined in consultation with the community and stakeholders.	
WR12	5-0418			No Objection	
WR13	5-0419			No Objection	
	5-0420		Section 5.1 the DCB is not referred to in the Introduction, although it is in the question above. We suggest amending this section to say '...additional policies that the Authority and the DCB will apply...'.	Section 5.1 can be amended accordingly	Amend section 5.1 as follows: "This section of the Planning Statement sets out the additional policies that the Authority <u>and the Board</u> will apply in respect of other considerations, <u>irrespective of the zone or overlay in which such feature may be located.</u> "
	5-0421		In section 5.7 there is a list of points under 'Environmental Preservation' which calls out in number 5 (page 27) for the protection of the geological characteristics of the Bluff. Why is the Bluff the only named site in the Environmental Preservation section to get a special mention? It makes other famous named sites like Little Cayman's Bloody Bay Wall, Booby Pond, and Owen Island seem like a glaring omission. If it the geological aspect that the statement strives to draw attention to, then there are other places with caves and karst limestone which are important in Little Cayman, such as the Sesuvium Marsh in Little Cayman. Likewise, the Bloody Bay Wall, a product of the fact that Little Cayman perches above the steepest ridge of the undersea Cayman Trench, is a singular geological feature the world over—it is as steep as K2 in the Himalayas is high. Perhaps it would be better to say "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands" and not favour the Bluff over any others, or at least make it just some examples within all three islands, by saying 'such as the Bluff on Cayman Brac and Bloody Bay Marine Park on Little Cayman.'	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the <u>Islands</u> . <u>Bluff in Cayman Brac</u> . "
	5-0422		Also in Section 5.7 under 'Coastal Zone Management' there is no wording covering the principle of limiting overall heights of buildings. Number 12 on page 27 mentions panoramic views and vistas, but could go on to say 'such as by having regard to the overall heights of buildings on the coast'.	Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in all zones.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR14	5-0423		Section 5.10 should include a caveat that the full list of factors may not be relevant to the Sister Islands. After the second introductory sentence, please add: 'Not all of these factors will be relevant to the Sister Islands. The Area Plan for each Island will address appropriate factors for the economy of each Island.'	Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0424		PADs -inappropriate for Little Cayman given Little Cayman's needs and goals	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	5-0425		Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of 'land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent' (page 23).	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land potentially on persons quality of life.	
	5-0426		Circulation and Transportation – encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles. Discourage cars, trucks and speeding. This is already supported by the current maximum speed limit on Little Cayman (25), which serves the island's sensitive endemic species like the Sister Islands Rock Iguana and should remain. If Port Zeus adds a ferry, Salt Rocks Dock would need to be adapted for foot passengers, not just for cargo only, and the nearby historic mule pen would need to be preserved. Consider adding a ferry or 'shuttle' concept to flights between the Brac and Little Cayman to reduce the need for moving the airport.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan. Ferry operations outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0427		Infrastructure – consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island improving cell service to the north side for emergency response. Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc. Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the landfill in Little is minimised.	Road construction and maintenance is under the remit of the National Roads Authority. Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal <u>and recycling</u> facilities";
	5-0428		Design – aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two habitable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency). Prohibit container homes.	Issues regarding appropriate and inappropriate building types, and building heights, can be considered during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	5-0429		Natural resources and coastline – seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	Issues regarding appropriate building heights, can be considered during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
	5-0430		Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications. Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands? Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review. The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	5-0431		Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation for features not requested by the local Little Cayman population. In Little Cayman minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	5-0432		Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive, low volume, and low key: diving, fishing, birdwatching, nature trails. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	5-0433		Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
WR15	5-0434		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR16	5-0435	OTHER POLICY CONSIDERATIONS	As each PAD will have their own unique development criteria and Development Statement. It is recommended that approved PAD documents be made public and included on the Department of Planning and Cayman LandInfo websites.	Noted. While this issue is outside the scope of the Planning Statement, the comment will be forwarded to relevant decision-makers to consider.	Consider public access to approved PAD documents / zoning information
	5-0436		5.3.3. I do not understand the problem this objective is trying to address. Is this referencing large remainder lots? Large parcels without adequate access?	The issue that s.5.3.3 is seeking to address is providing for greater cohesion in assessing the impact of major subdivisions. Area Plans will enable areas to be considered more holistically and so the value of large tracts of land (whether for agriculture, environment, future road corridors etc) can be considered. This policy also intends to protect large tracts of land that do not have the necessary infrastructure to support a subdivision and supports having interconnectivity between subdivisions instead of standalone fragmented developments.	
	5-0437		5.3.4. ...that can be linked with surrounding <u>vacant land, subdivisions, public & private roads, pathways</u> , or general infrastructure/public transportation.	Noted. This additional wording can be included in section 5.3	Amend section 5.3, as follows: "The Authority shall apply the Subdivision of Land policies, and other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, in a manner best calculated to: 1. Ensure that the layout and design of subdivision proposals are sensitive to a site's physical and environmental characteristics; 2. Make the most efficient use of land designated for the intended purposes; <u>and</u> 3. Prevent the unnecessary fragmentation of large tracts of open land; <u>and</u> 4. Incorporate infrastructure and transportation related design elements that <u>can be linked with surrounding vacant land, subdivisions, public & private</u>
	5-0438		5.4 - Will this form into mandated subdivision road design? It would be nice to see the following guidelines: • Reciprocal access easements connecting adjacent neighbourhoods; • Mandatory connections to adjacent lands along with requirement to fully construct; • Minimum standards for bus stops; • Mandatory pedestrian and bike lanes (sidewalks, striped shoulders, bike lanes).	Noted and agreed with the general recommendations. The National Roads Authority has Subdivision Guidelines and the suggested measures could be put forward for inclusion.	
	5-0439		There is no reference with how the Planning Statement coordinates with NRA's policies and long-term plans.	All stages of the Development Plan will be prepared in consultation with Government Departments and Agencies, which would include the NRA.	
	5-0440		How will this plan and the Development Plan adequately address the long-term needs of seaports and ensure sustainable standards for marine facilities? • How will CPA/DoP determine these needs? • Who will determine what is safe and sustainable? • It seems there should be a statement that coordination with CIAA, CAA and Port Authority is required.	All relevant government departments / agencies and stakeholders will be involved in all stages of the Development Plan review to define standards and needs for marine facilities. Full consultation will also take place at each stage of the Plan Review to ensure that policies represent the needs of the community. While the intention is certainly to consult with CIAA, CAA and Port Authority it is not considered necessary to list them in this section since it may inadvertently exclude other relevant persons / organisations.	
	5-0441		5.4.11. Support the long-range needs and alternatives for all types of " <u>aviation</u> " facilities throughout the Cayman Islands. Changing airport to aviation allows for alternative air transport modes such as helipads and vertiports.	Noted, this section can be amended accordingly.	Amend s.5.4(11 and 12), as follows: 11. Support the long-range needs and alternatives for all types of <u>airport-aviation</u> facilities throughout the Cayman Islands; and 12. Ensure that developments in the area surrounding airport lands do not impose a detrimental impact on <u>airport-aviation</u> operations. "
	5-0442		Stormwater & Drainage Is this envisaged to be a Govt endeavor to plan/design a long-range, holistic SWMP for an area, particularly for older parts of GT, BT, Raleigh Gardens, South Sound Basin?	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study led by NRA / Ministry PAHITD which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0443		Recommend that 5.5.6 is also included in Stormwater & Drainage.	Noted. This can be added to section 5.5 under Stormwater & Drainage	Insert new bullet point under 'Stormwater and Drainage' as follows: "- <u>Encourage the implementation of the latest technologies to minimize the impact of stormwater drainage practices.</u> "

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0444		5.6.2.iii To maintain and enhance the quality and character of development fronting a road " <i>and public shoreline</i> ".	Noted. This section can be amended accordingly.	Amend section 5.6.2(iii), as follows: <i>"iii. To maintain and enhance the quality and character of development fronting a road <i>and public shoreline</i> ;</i>
	5-0445		5.7.2. Who will be charged to classify important vegetation to be preserved or mitigated?	It is anticipated that important vegetation would be identified in consultation with Government Departments and Agencies, under s.7 of the Development and Planning Act.	
	5-0446		5.7.5. What about CMW, Ramsar sites? Through what means will these unique areas be preserved? Conservation easements, Crown acquisition, land register restrictions?	There are various mechanisms that address these issues (such as Protected Area process under NCA etc). The Planning Statement however introduces the NRPO (section 4.2) that would identify additional considerations / requirements for certain natural resources.	
	5-0447		5.7.7. How will coastal setbacks be determined? Will these be in consultation with DOE or legitimate Coastal Engineers? Please share data used to determine policy.	In 2021 Cabinet granted approval for a Government Technical Working Group to investigate the establishment of a Coastal Setback Reference Line for coastlines in the Cayman Islands. This will be determined through historical aerial imagery and the complementary development of a Coastal Category Setback map that considers shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations. Once these setbacks have been determined it is anticipated that they would be made available to the public.	
	5-0448		5.8. This section appears to have been inadvertently omitted	Noted.	
	5-0449		5.9.2.b. Specifically exclude NRA public roads. Will CPA require LPP (COS) be developed for recreation or be transferred to National Trust, DOE or Crown? (Refer to National Planning Framework Obj. 11.3.1)	The Planning Statement acknowledges the need to better utilise LPP properties. The mechanism for enforcing this is yet to be determined, but recreation / open space needs of each community could be identified as part of Area Plan preparation. Regulations would need to be amended to support this policy approach.	
	5-0450		5.10.3. How will this be determined?	Where appropriate Area Plans may include some criteria / methodology to consider the impact of retail developments on existing centres. It is anticipated this would only be necessary in Areas where existing centres have value to the community. This will be determined in consultation with the community and stakeholders.	
	5-0451		5.10.5. Is this a current problem the needs to be addressed? It seems the market has the flexibility to offer various-sized retail and office space.	This gives the CPA flexibility <i>if necessary</i> to ensure that the market is balanced in providing a range of unit size options.	
WR17	5-0452		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR18	5-0453		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR19	5-0454		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR20	5-0455		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	5-0456	5.2 - PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENTS (PADs)	We support Planned Area Developments but propose that the minimum size be reduced from 40 acres to an area as little as 10 acres to enable more Caymanians to reap the benefits of PADs.	Reducing the threshold area of 40 acres for the creation of Planned Area Developments was considered as part of the preparation of the draft National Planning Framework (NPF). However it was is considered that 40 acres is the minimum size needed to enable true mixed-use communities. Any smaller and PADs are likely to be focused on a particular land use.	
	5-0457	5.3 - SUBDIVISION OF LAND	No mandatory sidewalks-use part of the roads for sidewalks, but do not further burden homeowners with higher land costs.	Noted. Sidewalks are not typically required for subdivisions. The NRA has Subdivision Regulations which include sidewalks and any policies that are considered appropriate to support this in different neighbourhoods can be considered within Area Plans.	Consider Sidewalks in Subdivisions in each Area Plan (consider whether suitable in different zones)
	5-0458		Safety is an accepted priority, however, is there any data showing that subdivisions are more dangerous for traffic violations and pedestrian safety, than the general roadways?? Decisions should be supported by data. The requirement to install sidewalks in sub-divisions will certainly add costs to any sub-division developer's pockets, which will MOST CERTAINLY be passed on to a potential buyer; thereby making any and every house lot more expensive. Simply due to a regulation which is UNNECESSARY! This proposal should be ABANDONED. This is simply OVER-REGULATION for no documented purpose and will only make the cost of land ownership higher!!	Noted. Sidewalks are not typically required for subdivisions. The NRA has Subdivision Regulations which include sidewalks and any policies that are considered appropriate to support this in different neighbourhoods can be considered within Area Plans.	Consider Sidewalks in Subdivisions in each Area Plan (consider whether suitable in different zones)
	5-0459	5.4 - CIRCULATION AND TRANSPORTATION	We need a proper transportation system in Cayman. A proper bus terminal, not one where one person sits in a little booth and direct people, which mush together. We need a proper bus terminal, like we've seen in any other developed cities, and we need proper bus pick up and land off where the bus goes completely off the road, into a covered area or covered place, the people using the transport, pedestrians or citizens to wait, even if it rains, they shouldn't get wet. Every other Caribbean Island, much poorer than us, and not as good economically as us, has it. It would do every Caymanian good to visit Curacao, then you would see how they care about their people; and they put their people first.	Noted. This is supported by the Planning Statement document	
	5-0460		We recommend that Civic architectural and "Caymanian" design standards be defined and introduced.	Noted. This could form part of each Area Plan	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	5-0461	5.6 - DESIGN	CPA should be advised that the style of buildings should reflect our heritage, something such as Bermuda where buildings all look similar apart from downtown where there is more modern buildings.	Noted. This could form part of each Area Plan	
	5-0462		No walls are to be constructed on the beach or along the roadway. When we go and say let's give this one an opportunity with it then everybody got an opportunity to do it; and the Lawyers in Cayman are smarter than the politicians. I hate to say that but it's the truth. So, if we say no, then it is none and we are the owners of this rock. Our forefathers and I go back eight generations, nine now, in West Bay, right in Boatswain Bay, that's where it started and Mount Pleasant. So I have no apologies to make to nobody, we said none and it's going to be none.	Roadside and coastal walls are subject to setback regulations set out in the Development and Planning regulations. Should any local amendments be required these can be incorporated at Area Plan stage	
	5-0463	5.7 - NATURAL RESOURCES AND COASTLINE	Pleased to see the turn out - solid people/citizens, West Bayers concerned about our country and its future. The question I have is what was the reason for the pushback from changing from the highwater mark to another reference point, you mentioned that there was pushback; but can you give us some insight as to what was reason for that?	Section 5.7(7) of the draft Planning Statement indicates that coastal setbacks should be based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations	
	5-0464		That therefore sounds like political interference.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	5-0465		Therefore, that decision was in favour of those people who own land on the beach?	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	5-0466		I've been through some of what you're saying, just prior to the 1984, I believe it was, the highwater mark was sort of arbitrarily defined by us as surveyors and we yes, used the edge of the vegetation, used the edge of the turtle grass that was washed up, those were sort of features. In East End we used to refer to Vervine and some other plants that grew close to the edge of the water, that's the sort of arbitrary definition we used. In 84 or thereabout, they switched it to the numerical value based on the highwater based on zero elevation for the I don't know if that was, that would be the mean highwater I suppose and so they determine an elevation at Lobster Pot and that vicinity, that they accepted as zero elevation and using some as far as I understood, they just took some values from the tidal almanac and used that as general information to determines 0.5 elevation for high water marks. More recently, I think within the last five years - don't remember exactly when they change it to one foot elevation now. So that's the actual value we are using but if you walk the beach even during low tide you can't walk dry foot virtually, if that one foot elevation is not within the surge you in, high tide or whatever, it washes across that one foot elevation; so I think even in the lowest tide it's difficult to walk the beach dry foot, and like you indicate Kenneth, in areas of a low profile, some areas in Bodden Town and East End you have a little longer length of surge than you do on most of the West Bay Beach area. So but in both situations it's difficult to walk like how I indicated. It's a just a numerical value that they have established based on tidal observations more recently, the last one was the one for the elevation was determined based on some tidal elevations that have been recorded over the years but we find that that elevation bears a bit within the reef or the shoreline that is severed because the reef than it does here in West Bay where there is open or no reef, and then you refer to the Ironshore, that's and even more difficult situation because yes while you can determine that one foot elevation now, at times it is difficult to get to the position where you can measure that subject from the last setback and if we're thinking about the constituent's right to walk the beach and or to walk the coastline/ironshore that becomes virtually impossible in some areas. So you have a difficulty with coastline whether it's beach or ironshore, in regards to the survey definition.	Noted.	
	5-0467		What I'm saying is that if we want to ensure that the zones have already been set aside for that, are basically preserved and possibly expanded. Also, within the district we need to look at the road widening and walkways throughout the entire district. Coastal setbacks, I'm glad you talked about that, because there aren't any. The Highwater Mark is where you walk in the water. I ran West Bay Beach from 1970 something, we used to run from Boggy Sands to Pageant Beach and back. That's football training. There were only two places along that beach that we had to run in rocks; it was right above Silver Sands, and the other one was right behind Treasure Island. They were the only two. There was sand along that entire beach, it was cocoplum bush, it was grape trees and we used to call them weeping willow trees and through horse burs. So what I am saying, suggesting, that we should look at in order to preserve the little that we do have left of Seven Mile Beach and especially Barkers, where we have a tremendous amount of beach and natural habitat. I'm recommending that in the hotel zones or whatever it's going to be called in the New Development Plan, to look at: ☐ no development within 150 feet of the high watermark, none absolutely none. Within 150 to 300 feet, we only develop three stories; from 300 to 500 feet, we will do five stories; from 500 to 1000 feet we can then do 10 stories. So we have the similar approach that you talked about along the airport, so that everyone still has a full view of the beach; and absolute no removal of our natural vegetation, none.	Noted. Coastal setbacks will be reviewed as part of each Area Plan	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0468	5.8 - WATER LENSES	CIG to facilitate WA_C purchase of the East End water lenses as a matter of urgency.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	5-0469	5.10 - ECONOMY	I've just heard of it this is a quick Clytus, and it's based on I think what we just discussed while we were, and I did hear you the other day on [REDACTED] so I know it wasn't just this morning. Are you saying though, so that I am clear, Clytus because I respect you and your expertise in the area, are you saying that you don't think that there should be the sort of economic considerations in a Planning Act, for example, so that I am clear and maybe I missed it and maybe you did it another day, where do we go to from here and maybe you can answer the two because it gels well. So we have a statement that essentially will cause, using the example that you used earlier, where there were just one liners on things, but no flesh. So, we don't quite understand what it is that they want to do or what it is that they're saying. Is the process going to be where after the Regulations are considered they're going to come back and present it again or is it going to be debated within the house. Can you enlighten me on that path because that whole entire economic consideration there, says to my mind just why I would come back to it, based on your response?	Section 5.10 sets out high-level considerations for supporting Commercial, Tourism and Industrial activities. This is in keeping with 5.9(1) of the Development and Planning Act that states that a Development Plan may "allocate areas of land for use for agricultural, residential, industrial or other purposes of any use or class specified in the plan."	
WR22	5-0470		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR23	5-0471		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR24	5-0472	5.2 Planned Area Developments (PADs)	There should be allowance for multiple PADs of varying size (as appropriate) in each district. This should become more feasible (opens the door for more entrepreneurship and additional Caymanian developers) if relevant legislation ([Regulation 24(2)(a) of the Development and Planning Regulations (2024 Revision)]) is amended in due course to reduce the minimum size of PADs from 40 acres to 20 acres. Add a 3rd paragraph (just before the text box excerpt from legislation) as follows – 'To enable the benefits of moving toward districts' self-sufficiency, multiple PADs of varying size (as appropriate) will be supported.'	A reduction in the minimum size requirement of PADs from 40 acres to 20 acres is not a policy change that the CPA, DCB and DoP are actively considering at this time. It is considered that 40 acres is the minimum size needed to enable true mixed-use communities. Any smaller and PADs are likely to be focused on a particular land use	
	5-0473	5.3 Subdivision of Land through 5.4 Circulation and Transportation	Excellently written! No further observations.	Noted	
	5-0474	5.5 Infrastructure	Really well written! Minor tweaks recommended. To explicitly clarify that the environment is not "left to chance", would recommend adding a few words at the 3rd line of the 2nd paragraph after the word 'sustainably' 'Physical infrastructure (whether funded and provided by private or public sectors) should be developed in a cost-effective manner that safely, efficiently and sustainably (mindful of economic, social and environmental benefits) serves the community in the long term; through proper planning and development and the funding of routine maintenance.'	Noted, however section 1.6 identifies that Sustainable Development relates to Economic, Social and Environmental considerations.	
	5-0475		Stormwater and Drainage intentions at page 25 is spot on. Despite best intentions, current requirements are less than ideal. It is obvious that predominant reliance on drainage wells is insufficient. Item 8 at page 25 when tackled will need a significant shift in requirements. For instance, the jurisdiction can borrow from places of similar geology (e.g. limestone) with effective stormwater management and drainage. An example would be parts of Florida, where a combination of tools are used (including retention ponds where appropriate). For effective stormwater management and drainage to occur, a significant shift in current thinking will be necessary, possibly adding tools (such as retention ponds where appropriate) proving to be effective in jurisdictions of similar geology to the Cayman Islands (e.g. parts of Florida).	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	5-0476	5.6 Design	Excellently written! No further observations.		
	5-0477	5.7 Natural Resources and Coastline	Really well written! See recommended cross-reference at item 3.8 above. No further observations.	Noted	
	5-0478	5.8 Water Lenses through 5.10 Economy	Excellently written! No further observations	Noted	
	5-0479	5.10 Economy	Really well written! No further observations.	Noted	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR25	5-0480		Planned Area Developments are permissible in all areas of the Islands and all zones except Industrial, Open Space, and Mangrove Buffer' - Should this be the case? I personally don't believe that Low Density Residential Zones are suitable for Planned Area Developments. As I recall, there was much opposition to the Cayman Enterprise City development, in South Sound	The Planning Statement aims to allow PADs in areas that support dense development which the PAD can then contribute to. PADs have to submit master plans to include at least three different land uses and must be compatible with the surrounding area. Developments of such nature have notification requirements and objections will be heard by the Authority/Board before a decision is reached. Section 5.2 indicates that PADs should be compatible with the surrounding area and may be required to include natural buffers and/or transitional massing and scale at site peripheries to ensure that they do not adversely affect the character and value of surrounding areas.	
	5-0481		This is particularly important, for the enjoyment of all, and for generations to come. Sadly, this no longer exists along the Seven Mile Corridor; you're lucky if you can even catch a glimpse of the sea, between Hotels and Condominium complexes. I would not like to see the same thing happen to the coastlines of Bodden Town, East End, North Side, nor our beautiful Sister Islands.	The Planning Statement is a forward looking document and section 5.7(12) recognises the need to maintain panoramic views and vistas provided by the islands' coastline. This will be addressed through the use of setbacks and other design considerations that may vary per Area Plan.	
WR26	5-0482		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR27	5-0483		Consider the creation of a Sustainability and Resiliency policy section, on level footing with those other specified policy considerations (Circulation and Transportation, Infrastructure, Design, Natural Resources and Coastline, Water Lenses, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, and Economy). While there are aspects within existing policy categories associated with Sustainability and Resiliency, it may be beneficial to indicate heightened prioritization for Sustainability and Resiliency by listing it as a policy category outright.	Policies relating to Sustainability and Resiliency are incorporated throughout the draft Planning Statement, reflecting that sustainability concerns social, economic and environmental considerations.	
	5-0484	5.4	There is opportunity to align the Circulation and Transportation policy objectives with the 2024-2045 National Energy Policy and National Energy Policy Implementation and Monitoring Plan 2024-2045. Strategy 3.3.7.4, supporting Goal 3 of the National Energy Policy, calls to "assess policies to promote electric vehicle adoption in the Cayman Islands, including needs for EV charging infrastructure.... Such analysis shall consider the socioeconomic aspects of EVs including location of charging infrastructure... and explore methods to promote EV update in disadvantaged communities. Policies shall also advance planning and permitting processes for EV charging infrastructure to increase efficiency, promote transparency, and decrease costs." In the Implementation and Monitoring Plan, the associated action item for this strategy calls for requirements for "EV-designated parking spaces for roadside and residential, commercial and mixed-use properties", as well as dedicated conduit runs from utility transformers for EV charger provisions at new multi-unit residential and commercial construction.	Noted	
	5-0485	5.4	Accordingly, it is recommended that the Circulation and Transportation policy objectives include: Roads •Support the provision of publicly available, road-side electric vehicle charging infrastructure, with particular focus on locations where there is less opportunity for designated electric vehicle parking and publicly available charging infrastructure in multi-unit residential, commercial and mixed-use properties in the general vicinity. Parking Standards •Support the use of electric vehicles in the Cayman Islands by requiring the provision of dedicated electric vehicle parking spaces all new multi-unit residential, commercial and mixed-use construction. •Support the efficient cost of development for electric vehicle charging infrastructure provisions by requiring dedicated conduit runs from utility transformers for any new multi-unit residential, commercial and mixed-use construction.	Noted, and agree with the broad theme of the recommendation in supporting EV facilities. However, parking requirements are set out in Development and Planning Regulations and currently EV parking is only required in commercial buildings exceeding 5,000 sqft. The potential for road-side charging infrastructure would have to be considered by NRA and is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. Inclusion of policy relating to conduit runs is considered to be overly detailed for the Planning Statement document. However, some wording to this effect may be helpful to achieve this objective.	Amend section 5.4 as follows: "Parking Standards 3. Apply parking requirements that appropriately address diverse land uses, unique traffic characteristics and demands; 4. Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes <u>including facilities and infrastructure for Electric Vehicles</u> ;"

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0486	5.5	<p>There is an opportunity to expand the Infrastructure policy objectives for Roads and Electricity and Street Lighting to include strategies and objectives that will support sustainable and resilient infrastructure, while also aligning to the 2024-2045 National Energy Policy. It is therefore recommended that the Infrastructure policy objectives include:</p> <p>Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Support the provision of public-access, road-side electric vehicle charging infrastructure, with particular focus on locations where there is less opportunity for designated electric vehicle parking and public-access charging infrastructure in multi-unit residential, commercial and mixed-use properties in the general vicinity. <p>Electricity and Street Lighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Support long-range plans for building and maintaining a safe, resilient and efficient electricity transmission and distribution network, having regard to an integrated approach to infrastructure development.•Support the long-term strategy to facilitate the transition toward electrified transportation, with provision for publicly available electric vehicle charging infrastructure and EV parking spots in all new residential, commercial and mixed-use parking lots.•Minimize the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so.•Minimize the impact of street lighting on the natural environment.	<p>Noted, and thank you for the suggestions. Some of the suggested amendments can be incorporated into the 'Electricity and Street Lighting' section.</p> <p>Noted, and agree with the broad theme of the recommendation in supporting EV facilities. However, parking requirements are set out in Development and Planning Regulations and currently EV parking is only required in commercial buildings exceeding 5,000 sqft.</p> <p>The potential for road-side charging infrastructure would have to be considered by NRA and is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document.</p>	<p>Amend section 5.5 as follows:</p> <p><u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u></p> <p><u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u></p> <p><u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u></p> <p><u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u></p>
	5-0487		<p>Question 5 (Page 23-29) Section 5 - Other Policy Considerations</p> <p>In General - Recommend referencing and/or incorporating the National Energy Policy 2024-2045 Strategy, specifically 3.4.7 Land Use & Buildings: Ensure that the Development Plan is kept updated to fully reflect commitment to sustainable energy practices supporting healthy lifestyles and to encourage zoning diversity and mixed-use development.</p>	<p>These topics are reflected in the Planning Statement</p>	
	5-0488	5.2	<p>(Pg. 23) 5.2. Planned Area Developments. PAD's are required to include at least three different land uses on a given site. Recommend to require one of the 3 different land uses to be passive open space (or increase to 4 required uses).</p>	<p>Section 5.2 states that PADs are 'master planned developments of large tracts of land that provide for a mix of land uses, densities and open space'. The Development and Planning Regulations provide more details on the expected PAD standards to be set out in a Development Statement, and specifies 'provision of open spaces, both public and private'.</p>	
	5-0489		<p>Would the PAD areas be subject to the surrounding Area Plan? For example, would the 'Health City (PAD)' be restricted to adding a 10-story hotel if the East End Area Plan prohibited this? Recommend clarifying this detail in this section</p>	<p>No. The provisions included within the approved Development Statement for an approved PAD will remain in place.</p>	
	5-0490	5.3	<p>(Pg.23) 5.3 Subdivision of Land</p> <p>Recommend paragraphs 1-4, they should include reference to or the language of the above paragraph as what the Authority shall apply, for example: "Plans of subdivision must conform to the zoning requirements of the land to which they relate and should embrace the natural environment by retaining natural vegetation, key landscape features, and environmentally significant elements while controlling and retaining storm-water runoff and protecting property from flood damage."</p>	<p>Noted. This section can be amended to reflect some elements of the introduction text into the policy text box.</p>	<p>Amend s.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>Move following text into 'blue box' and delete from 2nd paragraph:</p> <p><i>"Subdivisions should embrace the natural environment by retaining natural vegetation, key landscape features, and environmentally significant elements while controlling and retaining storm-water runoff and protecting property from flood damage."</i></p>
	5-0491		<p>Paragraph 4 in the Subdivision of Land section. "Land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission for development on those parcels." Question: How does this statement interact with current requirements? Recommend making this section clear regarding sub division of parcels and subdivisions.</p>	<p>At present, this restriction is conveyed through CPA condition, as follows: <i>"There shall be no land clearing, excavation, filling or development of the resultant subdivided parcels (with the exception of the road parcel) without planning permission for such works being granted."</i></p> <p>The inclusion of this in the Planning Statement removes this as a discretionary condition.</p>	
	5-0492		<p>Paragraph 4 in the Subdivision of Land section. The same concern for fragmentation of "prime agricultural land" should be given to primary habitat. "The subdivision of land encompassing important or prime agricultural land shall not, except in exceptional circumstances, be permitted where it may: a. Fragment into separate lots neighboring fields which function as a farm unit or agricultural holding; or b. Result in good quality arable land being taken out of production." Recommend these same provisions extend to primary habitat</p>	<p>Primary habitat may be reflected in NRP Overlay designation, and may result in design solutions to mitigate impact (i.e. modified subdivision layout, enlarged LPP etc) to allow for subdivision on part of the site.</p>	
	5-0493		<p>5.4 Circulation and Transportation</p> <p>Second Sentence states "Opportunities for development to contribute to improvements in the transportation system, for all users, will be encouraged." Recommend this is expanded to include details on making transport development accessible for persons with disabilities including wheelchair users as they cannot access public transport at present. Reference in line with Disability/Older Peoples Policy, NEP.</p>	<p>Noted. Existing wording is considered appropriate since it refers to all users.</p>	
	5-0494	5.4	<p>Paragraph 11 Airports: - This section does not reference environmental considerations of airports, i.e future-proofing for different fuels and how those may impact aircraft in the future, or climate resiliency. Recommend making sufficient changes to address this.</p>	<p>The nature of aircraft in the future and fuel type is outside the scope of the Planning Statement</p>	
	5-0495		<p>Recommend this section mention EVs, charging stations, and Infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted, and agree with the broad theme of the recommendation in supporting EV facilities.</p>	<p>Amend section 5.4 as follows:</p> <p><u>"Parking Standards</u></p> <p><u>3. Apply parking requirements that appropriately address diverse land uses, unique traffic characteristics and demands;</u></p> <p><u>4. Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes including facilities and infrastructure for Electric Vehicles ;"</u></p>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	5-0496		Recommend this section include conditions for bicycle and pedestrian-safe travel. Ensure alignment with National Road safety strategy	Section 5.4(6 and 7) support safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists	
	5-0497		Recommend this section include park 'n ride and electric vehicle charging facilities under Parking Standards to signal support for the Cabinet-approved National Energy Policy 2024-2045.	Noted, and agree with the broad theme of the recommendation in supporting EV facilities. The Planning Statement supports 'alternative transportation modes' which is considered sufficiently broad to cover park-and-ride	Amend section 5.4 as follows: "Parking Standards 3. Apply parking requirements that appropriately address diverse land uses, unique traffic characteristics and demands; 4. Encourage the use of alternative transportation modes including facilities and infrastructure for Electric Vehicles ;"
	5-0498	5.5	(Pg. 25) 5.5. Infrastructure. Recommend to include a statement that generally captures the need to ensure infrastructure uses climate resilient and sustainability principles in their design, placement, and management.	Noted. The introductory sentence could be amended to reflect this.	Amend s.5.5 as follows: "Sustainable <u>and resilient</u> physical infrastructure, such as wastewater, potable water, roads, electricity, gas, and telecommunication facilities, is essential to supporting a growing population and maintaining its quality of life standards. "
	5-0499		Recommend this section reference climate resiliency that is outlined in the key climate threats to infrastructure in the Cayman Islands are mentioned in the CCRA.	Noted, see above	
	5-0500		Infrastructure Fund: Paragraph 1 - Suggestion to consider the implications of [continuing the] dependency of CIG on fees from development to fund and maintain public infrastructure. Recommend to devise a different or amended strategy for obtaining fees for public infrastructure.	This issue is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	5-0501		Recommend proceeds of this fund should extend to investments in other areas; e.g. alleviate flooding hot spots and facilitate new stormwater facilities identified in the Stormwater Management Plan, which should recognise the role inland mangroves and other wetlands can play as cost-effective green infrastructure.	Under s.37A of the Development and Planning Regulations, the Infrastructure Fund is established for the purpose of providing funds for development of roads, affordable housing and other infrastructure in the Islands. The fund is administered by the Ministry of Finance and allocations and disbursements approved by Cabinet. The fund does not exclude investments in the suggested areas.	
	5-0502		Recommend proceeds go towards building affordable housing and retrofitting housing to be energy efficient.	See above	
	5-0503		Paragraph 2 - Recommend this section clarify what this means for government stakeholders and how they can contribute to access funds and contribute to its distribution. Recommend to clarify how this fits in with the Capital Improvement Program as detailed in the NPF.	Paragraph 2 is a high-level policy to ensure that infrastructure development is coordinated. The specifics of this will be determined in due course in consultation with infrastructure providers. The Area Plan process will aid in this process. The Capital Improvement Programme remains a goal of the NPF, but requires a project champion to take it forward.	
	5-0504		Wastewater Paragraph 6 – Missing word “Encourage the implementation of the latest”	Agreed, the section can be corrected accordingly.	Amend s.5.5(6), as follows: "Encourage the implementation <u>of</u> the latest technologies to minimize the environmental impact of wastewater treatment practices. "
	5-0505		Stormwater and Drainage: Paragraph 8. Recommend adding "Ensure the use of innovative and green infrastructure to prevent, manage and reduce flooding."	Noted, reference can be included.	Amend s.5.5(8), as follows: "8. Ensure adequate stormwater infrastructure and design standards, <u>including innovative and green infrastructure, where possible, to prevent, manage and reduce flooding;</u>
	5-0506		Potable water Recommend adding to this section to take into consideration alternative energy sources that should be encouraged for the production of potable water using reverse osmosis which is very energy-intensive.	This is a recommendation for Potable water providers	
	5-0507		Electricity and Communication Recommend adding to this section to take into consideration buried infrastructure, including cost-sharing measures, which should be encouraged as extreme weather-related risk reduction mechanisms.	Noted. See suggested amendment	Amend section 5.5 as follows: "<u>Electricity and Street Lighting</u> 12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources; 13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so; 14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment. "
	5-0508		Fuel Recommend adding a statement in support of the long-term strategy (NEP 2024-2045) to electrify ground transportation, which over time should reduce the need for additional fuel stations and storage.	Noted, however the 'fuel' section of 5.5 in the Planning Statement relates to fuel in a broader sense than that which supports ground transportation	
	5-0509		Solid Waste Recommend adding a section regarding Recycling/composting under Solid Waste.	Noted, reference can be added accordingly	Amend s.5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal facilities <u>, including recycling and composting facilities ;</u>"
	5-0510		Waste Water – Stormwater and Drainage Recommend adding in support for expanding the sewerage system.	The reference to 'alternatives to individual septic tanks' in s.5.5(5) is considered to be sufficiently broad to include this.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0511	5.6	(Pg. 26) 5.6. Design Recommend to strengthen wording (e.g., require, ensure) in this section, especially under the resiliency category. Suggestion to include in the latter provisions on renewable energy and energy efficiency.	Wording is softer because it is recognised that some building design measures can increase costs and therefore are not suitable for all projects. Area Plans and Regulations will provide a means of determining thresholds for requiring measures, which might be determined by size of project or location (i.e. within Heritage Preservation Overlays etc).	
	5-0512		The image in this section showcases all non-native species. Recommend showcasing native plants.	Noted. This image can be replaced when an alternative image is identified	REPLACE IMAGE - p.26
	5-0513		Site design Paragraph 2. Recommend to include "native" landscaping in this section.	Noted, a reference can be added accordingly.	Insert new point in 'Site Design' (s.5.6): "2. <u>Encourage native plantings and natural vegetation in landscaping schemes.</u> "
	5-0514		Building Design Paragraph 3. In addition to 'appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses'. Recommend adding the reference to culturally significant design elements in this section	Noted, a reference can be added accordingly.	Amend s.5.6(3), as follows: "3. <u>Encourage appropriate aesthetics ,including culturally significant design elements, and compatibility with surrounding uses;</u> "
	5-0515		Resiliency Paragraph 7. Question: How and where will "resilient design" be defined? One would argue passive solar design noted in the Building Design subsection is a component of resilient design. Wording in this section is somewhat redundant to Sensitive Coastal Overlay, however important to acknowledge that resilient design is not just needed in coastal areas, which may have to be required, not simply encouraged. Recommend changing this sentence to include the requirement for resilient design in all aspects of building and to reference where the design elements can be sought.	As noted, resilient design may take many different forms, depending on location and context. Area Plans can define appropriate resilient design and this can be reflected in Regulations. Section 5.6(7) 'encourages' resilient design rather than 'requires' because it is acknowledged that in certain situations such design measures may have unintended consequences on a project, such as increased costs. Nevertheless, the Authority will encourage such measures throughout the Islands.	
	5-0516		Public Realm Recommend adding more to this section. What does this mean? How will it work?	This will be determined in Area Plans. Different solutions and requirements will be identified in different areas (i.e. George Town may include requirements for public plazas, Seven Mile Beach may have requirements for pedestrian facilities on West Bay Road). Area Plans can also determine the 'larger projects' threshold for this requirement	
	5-0517	5.7	(Pg. 27) 5.7. Natural Resources and Coastline The image in this section showcases the invasive coastal species casuarina and scaevola. Recommend changing this photo to a more appropriate photo with native species.	Noted. This image can be replaced when an alternative image is identified	REPLACE IMAGE - p.27
	5-0518		Paragraph 1-5 - Recommend this section be more specific and strengthen wording by removing minimize impact to Preserve, under Environmental Preservation (e.g., Preserve important vegetation, preserve ecosystems and biodiversity found within development sites, Preserve surface and groundwater quality)	The current wording is considered sufficient. Outright 'preserve' may sterilise some parcels, where the wording included in the draft Planning Statement is more balanced. The NRP Overlay can help to determine the natural resources that are worthy of preservation.	
	5-0519		Paragraph 1 -5 Recommend changing wording from important to native/endemic.	Noted. This section can be amended accordingly.	Amend s.5.7(2), as follows: "2. <u>Preserve or mitigate for the loss of important native / endemic vegetation;</u> "
	5-0520		Although emphasises the importance of the natural environment generally, this section seems a little redundant if the NRPO includes both protected areas, critical habitat and other sensitive areas, and the SCO contains comparable principles to the Coastal Zone Management subsection. Recommend suitably incorporating this section into 5.6 DESIGN Site Design and Building Design subsections. This would demonstrate the integrated consideration and appropriate use of natural resources and the coastal zone at the site and building schematic design stages required to ensure the strategic objectives of securing biodiversity and ensuring sustainable use of natural resources are achieved and not afterthoughts or relegated to LPP/POS.	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. The current wording and format is considered suitable to provide a clear reference to these issues.	
	5-0521		Suggest the term "natural resources" reflects an extractive, etic approach to the treatment of the environment which further contributes to the growing human-nature divide by ignoring the intrinsic value of nature. It is also unclear as to how natural resources and the natural environment are different. Recommend changing this sentence to take account of these points, utilizing the phrase Natural Ecosystem.	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. However, the current wording and format is considered suitable as the term 'natural resource' is widely understood and more tangible / physical than 'ecosystem'. The term 'natural ecosystem' is referred to in s.5.7(3).	
	5-0522	5.8	(Pg. 28) 5.8. Water Lenses Water Lenses Description: Language is inconsistent with the rest of the document: "The policy in respect of proposals for development on land above water lenses will be that..." Paragraph 2 - Recommend supporting very strict regulation (or requirements in planning applications e.g., only permit organic, low-impact agriculture methods) with agricultural use of pesticides over freshwater lenses.	The introductory wording is related to the structure and content of the subsequent bullet points. There are other examples on the draft Planning Statement of this form of wording. Section 5.8(5) states that 'strict conditions will be imposed to ensure that the water in the lens will not be contaminated by the development...'. This is inclusive of agricultural development referenced in (2).	
	5-0523		Paragraph 3 - Why would industrial developments that require a supply of water readily available be permitted over a water lens? Water lenses are not able to sustain unlimited abstraction. Strongly recommend removing this paragraph.	This is a direct reference to existing Development and Planning Regulations. Additionally, section 5.8(5) states that "strict conditions will be imposed to ensure that...the quantity of water used will not deplete the lens to the disadvantage of existing or future users".	
	5-0524		Paragraph 4 - Supports the strong language in this section especially point 4, but wonder how "adjacent to a freshwater lens", which likely expands and contracts, is defined. Recommend making this clearer in this section.	Noted. A reasonable buffer can be defined in regulations.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0525	5.9	(Pg. 28) 5.9. Parks, Rec, Open Space. Recommendation: Is there a need for this section if information in points 1 and 2 are already found in Section 3.8 OPEN SPACE ZONES? The remaining point 3 could be incorporated into Section 3.3 RESIDENTIAL ZONES where appropriate	Yes, this section is still necessary because Parks, recreation and open spaces may also be located in other zones (outside of Open Space Zones), in association with other developments. Also, point 3 relates to both residential and commercial projects.	
	5-0526		Paragraph 2c – Recommend adding ecosystems to this paragraph "...natural resources and ecosystems."	Agreed, the section can be corrected accordingly.	Amend s.5.9(2), as follows: "2. <i>Utilise Lands for Public Purposes (LPP) requirements to enable the provision of:</i> <i>a. Active/passive recreation facilities;</i> <i>b. Public rights of way; and/or</i> <i>c. The protection of valuable natural resources and ecosystems.</i> "
	5-0527		Recommend changing the emphasis regarding passive open space in #3. (e.g., make a requirement).	The emphasis is considered to be appropriate since some 'major developments' may have site constraints that prevent the provision of open space / recreation facilities. Do recommend minor amendment for the sentence to be consistent with open space wording in other sections of the document.	Amend s.5.9(3), as follows: "3. <i>Require major developments, including multi-family residential and large commercial projects, to provide recreation facilities or open space or active/passive open space recreation facilities, where appropriate.</i> "
	5-0528		Recommend adding a new section 5.11 CLIMATE CHANGE with assistance from the MSCR - Supporting Climate Change policies is essential to reduce the impact of Climate Change on the Cayman Islands. The Authority will therefore seek to ensure that recommendations made are..... Climate Resiliency The Authority shall apply the Climate Resiliency policies, and other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, in a manner best calculated to: 1. Ensure recommendations made are reviewed and planning relations updated 2. No approval ofxxx.....	Climate change and resiliency measures are incorporated throughout the Planning Statement.	
WR29	5-0529		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR30	5-0530		How will the prevention of clearing of subdivided lots until they are ready to be built upon be enforced? How will the developers be encouraged to retain native vegetation? Will there be mandates based on expert opinion?	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan. Provisions for enforcement will fall within the remit of the Compliance Unit within the Department of Planning. Identification of native vegetation will occur as part of Section7 consultation with government departments and agencies.	
	5-0531		One of the major concerns with our Sister Islands membership is that development of residential and tourism properties is occurring before the development of the critical infrastructure cited in 5.5, how will this be addressed? The infrastructure (sewage, power, water, etc.) needs to be in place before the places for more people are built.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
	5-0532		Who is consulted on the design of developments? Are experts in the traditional vernacular of Cayman? Experts in the issue of protecting what natural resources are possible? Landscaping should conform to Cayman’s climate and use vegetation that does not deplete our valuable resources.	Area Plans will determine what appropriate aesthetics are desired for each Area as well as any particular landscaping requirements.	
	5-0533		There are many impacts that can cross boundary lines (5.6.2.v.), from flooding, to noise, to the attraction of invasive pest species due to extensive clearing. Will these be considered in planning decisions?	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies.	
	5-0534		How will the Natural Resource policies in 5.7 be implemented and enforced? Will there be experts involved in the planning process? How will they be prioritized?	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	5-0535		What does 5.7.5 mean for the existing but unbuilt sub-division at the eastern end of the bluff? Will there be setbacks enforced for both the top and bottom of the bluff edge?	Noted. It is recommended to amend this section to reflect more geological features in the islands. The Brac Area Plan will consider appropriate setbacks on The Bluff edge.	
	5-0536		Will environmental experts be involved in determining appropriate setbacks?	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	5-0537		How will the open character of the beach and the views of the coast be preserved? There are large areas of Cayman’s beaches which cannot be seen by the public due to major developments along the shore and where the beach will be in the shade of buildings until afternoon.	The Planning Statement is a forward looking document and section 5.7(12) recognises the need to maintain panoramic views and vistas provided by the islands' coastline. This will be addressed through the use of setbacks and other design considerations that may vary per Area Plan.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	5-0538		How will enforcement of the water lens protection occur?	It will be enforced via the CPA using the policies as set out in Section 5.8 and the Development and Planning Regulations that will be updated.	
WR31	5-0539		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR32	5-0540		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
WR33	5-0541		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF1	6-001		Fig 1.2 : Indicative Area Plan boundaries - These areas need to be smaller to properly be able to create community-based area plans, and to accommodate things like drainage and transport plans, etc. Maybe the ESO & the work they did for the Boundary Commission can indicate some natural socioeconomic divisions that are more reflective of current 'districts', e.g., West Bay 'coastal ring' and 'inner core'.	Noted and appreciate the suggestion. The indicative Area Plan boundaries proposed in section 1.4 of the draft Planning Statement were selected based on broad considerations of existing and future character of the places. The suggestion of smaller 'Areas' is noted however it is considered that smaller areas would incur additional time constraints on the overall project since each Area Plan is subject to consultation, approval in Parliament etc. The proposed 11 Area Plans is considered to be suitable.	
	6-002		Sensible having a Central Mangrove Wetland area. Suggest likewise adding a 'Bluff Top' zone (as different from the lower coasts on the Brac).	Noted. Appreciate the suggestion but it is considered that a single Area Plan better represents the needs of Cayman Brac as a whole.	
	6-003		Having the one Industrial Area is a problem however, given the Industrial Zones in the plan and the need to dot them around the country holistically (reduce transport costs, etc.) But speaks to why integrating residential/commercial/industrial (as difficult as that is with pollution issues) is needed: Industrial Area, Inner Suburb, etc. Cayman is just too small to assume that we can truly sperate uses to this degree. Integration is the way to go. (New Urbanism! in Planning-speak I believe.)	Noted. The Area Plan process will enable members of the community to suggest appropriate zoning for their area. Appropriately located light industrial zones and neighbourhood commercial zones would be encouraged. Section 3.5 of the Planning Statement indicates that the Authority shall ensure adequate long-term supply of industrial land to meet market demand and that this will be both within existing industrial areas as well as identifying areas suitable for locally-serving light industrial uses in outlying districts.	
FF2	6-004		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF3	6-005		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF4	6-006		This document needs to be entirely transformed from one containing vague language and objectives which are entirely subjective into a plan that includes real objectives that are specific, measurable and timebound. It should include mapping, specific proposed regulations and all relevant information to allow the people that will be subject to it to be adequately informed prior to any decisions being made about its implementation.	The aim of the Planning Statement is to present broad policy outcomes alongside proposed planning zones. More specific policies and ultimately regulations will be derived from the next phase of the Development Plan process - Area Plans.	
FF5	6-007		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF6	6-008			No Comment	
FF7	6-009		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF8	6-011		Yes. I applaud the planners for saving our ground water lenses, which have not been well protected in the past – in particular, for forbidding extraction of aggregate lying on top of these natural lenses, built up over the eons and carrying us through even long periods of drought such as we are suffering at this moment (month of May, 2024). We have already run out of easily accessible water due to bad decisions (by planning bodies and others) in the recent past. This has caused us ALREADY to have to "make water" by reverse osmosis using saline groundwater, at a huge expense in electricity ... and we have been caught short on MY island (Cayman Brac) but being short-shipped with trucked water, and having our pressure reduced in the case of piped water. This is a scandal. In particular, quarry operators we authorized to excavate CLOSER TO THE LENSES than before -- causing the lenses to recede in the manner thay do when located under high ground.	Noted. Section 5.8 of the Planning Statement acknowledges the valuable contribution of water lenses and prohibits aggregate excavation above or adjacent to them.	
	6-012		My second commendation is very basic -- THANK YOU GOD for including our blessed Sister Islands in a grand plan, for the first time in history. It has been a matter of "laissez faire" up to now and builders, including very wealthy builders and owners, have been allowed to get away with ecological murder. When I was a lad, 3/4 of Planet Earth was forest, jungle and "bush"; now it is less than 1/4 ... in one man's lifetime!! In my home on Cayman Brac we need to SET ASIDE 3/4, which means protecting all that is left and re- planting much that has been lost. (I and my friends have planted over 50 native mahogany trees, a native species which was deleted from our lives, for making coffins and for other "total loss" uses. This is a cup of water in the sea of loss.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-013		Missing in your plan??? A TOTAL CAP ON POPULATION because everyone can see how we are going downhill as a society as our numbers zoom up without controls. I will be glad to help in any way I can.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-014		I have learned to identify virtually every native tree, shrub and flowering plant and their presence is my biggest satisfier. The residents who old when I arrived, 32 years ago, could do the same but this knowledge is no longer valued. BRING BACK OUR NATURE! Let it be our enduring blessing and treasure. [REDACTED]	<p>The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".</p> <p>Area Plans will give the opportunity to define the character of a specific Area.</p>	
FF9	6-015		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF10	6-016		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF11	6-017		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF12	6-018		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF13	6-019		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF14	6-020		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF15	6-021		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF16	6-022		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF17	6-023		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF18	6-024		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF19	6-025		"My family came to Grand Cayman in 1993 for the diving and bought a condo in 2007 and never went anywhere else. My fear, and what I see, is that Seven Mile Beach is becoming Miami Beach or Honolulu. A big city with a beach not a beach destination. A stopover on the way to somewhere else. That SMB will become a wall of high rise condos/hotels. I will be a delicate dance to balance growth vs. retaining the charm of Cayman that has made it the destination it is. Thanks for the opportunity to express my concerns."	<p>The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".</p> <p>Area Plans will give the opportunity to define the character of a specific Area.</p>	
FF20	6-026		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF21	6-027		Coastal setbacks should be changed to the historical vegetation line where the coastline is an active beach	Planning Statement acknowledges the need to review coastal setbacks.	
FF22	6-028		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF23	6-029		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF24	6-030			No Comment	
FF25	6-031			No Comment	
FF26	6-032		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF27	6-033		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF28	6-034			No Comment	
FF29	6-035		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF30	6-036		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF31	6-037		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF32	6-038		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF33	6-039		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF34	6-040		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF35	6-041		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF36	6-042		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF37	6-043		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF38	6-044		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF39	6-045		More focus should be given to preserving the natural habitat and heritage of Cayman and severe fines should be placed on those who go against process e.g. clearing land prior without approval, whether it would later be given or not. Where land is being cleared for development, a plan should be in place to maintain as much natural growth as possible.	<p>Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.</p> <p>Provisions for enforcement will fall within the remit of the Compliance Unit within the Department of Planning.</p> <p>Identification of native vegetation will occur as part of Section7 consultation with government departments and agencies.</p>	
FF40	6-046		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF41	6-047		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF42	6-048		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF43	6-049		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF44	6-050		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF45	6-051		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF46	6-052			No Comment	
FF47	6-053			No Comment	
FF48	6-054		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF49	6-055		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF50	6-056		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF51	6-057		<p>As a West Bay (part time) resident from 1980 I've been deeply saddened by the obvious lack of vision in Cayman's growth. With every passing year this bucolic gift has been abused by greed and myopic thinking. The recent storms in the past six months have magnified the consequences as we see the damages resulting from poor planning. I attended the West Bay community meeting last week and I agree with so many that there needs to be thoughtful consideration, and monitoring, of proper growth to ensure this island can sustain a future. Population density, proper infrastructure for transportation, limited building and reduced height of the new buildings. All of this is ruining what attracts people to Cayman. The beauty of the sparkling beaches and clear sea is being ignored and compromised by the excessive building ~> which puts too many people on the island. Which then adds to the increase in car accidents. Damage to the water, reefs, and turtle population. I'm particularly distressed about the increase height of building along SMB. Why ruin what makes Cayman so special. I was horrified when the Ritz went up and it's only gotten worse. West Bay is/was a wonderfully quiet residential community which is now threatened. Please please please protect Cayman NOW.</p>	<p>The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to " maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development.</p>	
FF52	6-058			No Comment	
FF53	6-059		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF54	6-060		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF55	6-061		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF56	6-062		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF57	6-063		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF58	6-064		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF59	6-065			No Comment	
FF60	6-066		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF61	6-067			No Comment	
FF62	6-068			No Comment	
FF63	6-069		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF64	6-070			No Comment	
FF65	6-071		Generally we need to do less and better as it relates to destroying land, building only 75m from the sea etc.	Planning Statement acknowledges the need to review coastal setbacks.	
FF66	6-072		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF67	6-073		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF68	6-074			No Comment	
FF69	6-075		Residents on the Brac were led to believe (as posted in the Cayman Compass) that we were going to have a community meeting to voice concerns. When we showed up to Ashton Rutty Center on 8 July. 2024 at 7pm, the doors were locked.	Due to the passage of hurricane Beryl on July 4th, public consultation for North Side and Cayman Brac had to be postponed and rescheduled.	
FF70	6-076			No Comment	
FF71	6-077		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF72	6-078			No Comment	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF73	6-079		S		
FF74	6-080		I believe this document is something that was a long time overdue. Developers in the future will need to adhere to the criteria of this document. I have seen the beaches and ocean deteriorate over the many years of living on Grand Cayman. The resorts and buildings have become too large, with too many people using various areas of the beach and ocean, without regard to the natural beauty of the island. We need to maintain the quality and character of the Cayman Islands. This document will ensure that future development will not "kill the goose that laid the golden egg." Now let's see that the values and ideas this document sets out are enforced!!!	Noted. It is for these reasons we are currently undergoing the process to have an updated plan that will reflect the needs of the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF75	6-081		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF76	6-082		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF77	6-083		I made it already INFRASTRUCTURE, INFRASTRUCTURE, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLEASE LEARN FROM LOOKING AT GRAND CAYMAN!!!	Noted	
FF78	6-084		In Section 5.7, Item 5 says to preserve the unique characteristics of the Bluff in Cayman Brac. I support this and request that several more unique areas on Little Cayman are added: Booby Pond (unique avian environment, and RAMSAR site) Tarpon Lake (fishing resource) Point of Sand (traditional recreation area) Owen Island (traditional recreation area) Sesuvium Marsh (unique ecological area) Booby Pond & Rookery - Ramsar site no. 702. The site is a representative example of a coastal, landlocked, mangrove- fringed saline lagoon system of a kind that is widespread among low-lying islands in the region. It contains a breeding colony of approximately 7,000 Red-footed Boobies (Sula sula) which accounts for at least 30% of the total Caribbean population.	Section 5.7 can be amended to reflect broad geological characteristics, rather than the Bluff specifically.	Amend s5.7(5), as follows: "Preserve the unique geological characteristics of the Islands Bluff in Cayman Brac ."
FF79	6-085		Can you provide information as to the progress in implementing public park space, children's playgrounds? We have a significant lack.	The Planning Statement in Section 3.8 speaks to making provisions for preserving lands for public enjoyment and protect them from non-recreational development. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
FF80	6-086			No Comment	
FF81	6-087		As discussed at the meeting held on 15th July, Little Cayman is unique amongst the districts of the Cayman Islands, and part of its uniqueness is that there is broad consensus amongst residents and homeowners there as to how they would like to see the island developed.	Noted. This is one of the reasons for proposing a Little Cayman Area Plan that will be prepared in consultation with the community.	
	6-088		As suggested at the meeting, Little Cayman ought to have its own Development Planning Board comprised of Caymanians who own property on Little Cayman and who spend a minimum of x (with this number to be determined by consensus) days per year on the island. Handel Whittaker, as Deputy Chairman of the Planning Board and someone who owns property on Little Cayman and who spends quite a lot of time there would be an obvious choice to be the first Chairman of such a proposed Board. This Board, or a Steering Committee appointed by it, could in the first instance develop a recommended Area Plan for LC which is badly needed, and then be tasked with approving all future Planning applications for any development or construction on the island. These people would be best informed as to the broad consensus of what the residents and homeowners in LC want.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF82	6-089		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF83	6-090		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF84	6-091			No Comment	
FF85	6-092			No Comment	
FF86	6-093		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF87	6-094		On residential cliff properties, walls along the edge of the cliff and pathways down to the sea should per permitted.	Walls for cliff properties are subject to setback provisions outlined in the Development and Planning Regulations, and Fence and Wall Guidelines document.	
	6-095		Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback and it is my sincere hope this is not an exercise in futility. Thoughts of Vision 2008 haunt me and we have paid a dear price for not implementing the recommendations of that plan. Please do not wait until everything is perfect, that time will never come. It is imperative that the planning for Little Cayman and Cayman Brac take place as a priority so that their unique characteristics are not obliterated as has occurred in Grand Cayman. Each of the 3 Cayman Islands is unique and must be treated that way. Please safeguard the uniqueness of each one and do not allow them all to resemble Grand Cayman which is unrecognizable to many of us who are born and raised here.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF88	6-096		I am concerned that area plans will be done so slowly. The D&PA requires that development plans are done every 5 years. At the current estimate of 1-2 plans per year, we will be well past the statutory requirements once again before this plan is implemented. Every aspirational plan we have for Little Cayman could look completely different/be obsolete by the time its Area Plan is submitted and approved. Please find an alternative means of review in order to speed the process.	Resources will be allocated to the PlanCayman process as necessary to achieve delivery of the various stages and documents.	
	6-097		One last comment: Too many especially large- scale developments ongoing and proposed are completely foreign owned. Their sole objective is ROI with zero interest on the economic, social, infrastructural costs to our country as a whole. Those costs are born solely by the Caymanian people. Are we not past the stage where we need so much one-way, foreign owned and controlled development? The vast majority of Caymanians do not benefit from this. Certainly, the next generation of Caymanians will not have even a dream of owning land much less building on it. We need to take a pause and consider the interests of the next generation of Caymanians. We have no right to continue relying on the cash cow of development which only benefits a few. We have a much greater responsibility; we must have regard for those who come after us.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF89	6-098		General comments not related to specific sections. Legislation implementing Plan Cayman should be written in such a way that it is not easy for subsequent governments to reverse zoning plans and specific interpretations thereof. Of course, as time goes on later governments need to be able to do things truly necessary and for which a consensus exists. But it needs to be avoided that each time a political party or group that prefers certain sorts of development are in power, they can quickly change restrictions. In that scenario after a few political cycles the plan is useless, the island will be heavily developed and no longer a special place of value to the Caymans as a whole.	Noted. Legislation drafting to support the Planning Statement is a later phase in the Plan Review. As part of the consultation process for PlanCayman all submitted representations are recorded and uploaded to the PlanCayman website with responses	
	6-099		Little Cayman is unique in that most of the residents and property owners are non Caymanian, of various different sorts of status under Cayman Islands law. The Plan Cayman meeting talked about all residents having a voice. It must be ensured that the voices heard at such meeting and in submissions such as this are not ignored because in the case of Little Cayman many will not be from Caymanians. Ignoring the majority of voices from the island for that reason would result in a very partial and fragmented view.		
FF90	6-100			No Comment	
FF91	6-101			No Comment	
FF92	6-102			No Comment	
FF93	6-103			No Comment	
FF94	6-104		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF95	6-105		Revise it to specifically address Cayman Brac! This planning statement once again signals that Grand Cayman is the only Cayman Island. This planning statement ignores the at-will bulldozing, land clearing, and illegal dump practices that are happening on the Brac.	The Planning Statement is drafted to incorporate all 3 islands whilst factoring in flexibility, acknowledging that each island will have unique needs. As stated in section 1.4, both Cayman Brac and Little Cayman will have separate Area Plans that will reflect their specific needs of those places.	
FF96	6-106			No Comment	
FF97	6-107		I am very grateful to see this Planning Statement and for the work being done by our civil servants (and any others) to create a development plan. There is much that is laudable here for considering community and social needs, climate resiliency and the environment, our heritage, etc. and I hope that the driving force behind this will continue to be the will of the people with an emphasis on quality of life for current and future generations of Caymanians and residents.	Noted.	
	6-108		Specifically, the planning statement should include a cap on building heights (an 8 storey maximum is probably more than sufficient) in line with what is in keeping with our culture, environment and size; logistical issues such as earthquake threats and fire safety; and the desires of the population - not on the wishes of a tiny number of developers seeking to construct taller buildings.	Setback and building heights will be considered at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	6-109		Looking at the Planning Statement Draft 2024 is a good document. However in many instances the document tends to exert and/or assume power in areas that are devolved to other Government departments, agencies, and/or authorities. Though it may not be the case the Planning Department and Central Planning Authority should take a collaborative approach with other Government agencies, authorities, and departments to carryout the Planning Statement successfully. It appears the CPA and Planning Department are falling short in this area.	All stages of PlanCayman will be prepared in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-110		Areas of Concern page 2 - page 29 1. Signage for Heritage Preservation Overlap (HPO) to demarcate visible built heritage	Outside of the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-111		2. How does the PAHI/CPA determine the designation of a Heritage/Natural Resource, etc (i.e. is the criteria unbiased, not designed to benefit businesses with interests that may not be beneficial to young Caymanians)	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF98	6-112		3. Which authorities will assist in the management/designation of zones.	The Planning Statement defines the various zones and overlays which will be applied to individual parcels during the preparation of Area Plans in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-113		4. Can the language of this Planning Statement be revisited to be more inclusive of young Caymanians (i.e. in specific/plain terms that are more widely understood)?	The Plan represents the needs of the whole community. Alternative methods to engage with the community during each phase of the Development Plan review will be considered.	
	6-114		5. How does the Development Plan support affordable housing for Caymanians or collaborate with relevant CIG authorities to protect (future) residential zones? (Today you also noted that it would be beneficial to understand/see the criteria for establishing residential zones, reflected in the Planning Statement and/or an appendix)	<p>The draft Planning Statement acknowledges the challenge of 'supply and Cost of Housing' (section 2.5) along with the need to provide housing for all income levels (section 3.3).</p> <p>The Plan will incorporate other government initiatives such as the government's Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan, led by Ministry of PAHITD.</p>	
	6-115		6. How does the Development Plan support the transportation system (i.e. address development needs/infrastructure); and will this be taken into consideration when zones are designated	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4. The Planning Statement supports effective and efficient circulation and transportation and is flexible to support public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-116		(also will agencies such as CIG departments, hospitals and other resources be advised or consulted ahead of these zones being designated; so as to plan for the future needs of the population)?	Subsequent phases of the Plan Review will be prepared in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-117		7. Will budget be put aside to ensure there are sufficient community resources to support the growing population and its needs?	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement. This is subject to the community facility provider.	
	6-118		8. Accessible transportation is a major issue for the elderly/aging population (how will this Plan benefit them and the community at large)?	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement notes that opportunities for development to contribute to improvements in the transportation system for all users, will be encouraged. The Planning Statement is flexible and drafted to accommodate public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD.	
	6-119		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF99	6-120		Need more detail on how the new zoning and overlays will be determined, not clear who decides? A public vote of land owners in the area or someone in Gov? How would someone who suffers a restriction/downgrade in the land be compensated? Need to be more focused on strategies to use land more efficiently, more higher densities which will reduce housing costs. Most of the damage in storms will be from flooding, so encourage housing on higher elevated land with medium and higher densities. Every 1-2 miles needs some commercial zoning.	<p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).</p> <p>Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged.</p>	
	6-121		I dont get the estate residential zoning, think that is illogical, as land owners can make their lot sizes bigger if they want/if the market demands it. Look at the average sizes of the houses being built and calculate efficient lot sizes for the zoning. Seems to be aversion to higher densities as public thinks its low income, could do more public awareness of high end/higher density developments	<p>Estate Residential is one of many options available in providing a mix of housing and living solutions. Persons who own large estate properties may apply this zone to their properties. The proposed ER zoning would allow for small agricultural uses which are limited to secondary uses at the site. It is not anticipated that during the area plan phase that this will be heavily used however it is still providing an option to properties that meet the requirement as set out in Section 3.3.8 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Certain locations may be suitable for increased density and smaller lot sizes, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.</p>	
FF100	6-122		No Comment		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF101	6-123		I am very grateful to see this Planning Statement and for the work being done by our civil servants (and any others) to create a development plan. There is much that is laudable here for considering community and social needs, climate resiliency and the environment, our heritage, etc. and I hope that the driving force behind this will continue to be the will of the people with an emphasis on quality of life for current and future generations of Caymanians and residents. Specifically, the planning statement should include a cap on building heights (an 8 storey maximum is probably more than sufficient) in line with what is in keeping with our culture, environment and size; logistical issues such as earthquake threats and fire safety; and the desires of the population - not on the wishes of a tiny number of developers seeking to construct taller buildings.	Building height restrictions for each zone will be determined within each Area Plan to meet the particular needs of each place.	
FF102	6-124			No Comment	
FF103	6-125		The area plan zone outer suburb should be renamed as Bodden Town as the outer suburb name is culturally insulting as all the other districts have their historical name. Secondly, it gives the wrong impression of the large tract of land for future generations as currently, this area has a wide variety of zoned activities from heavy industry with the quarries to the east side. Historic zones of Pedro Castle, commercial centers at Savannah, BT, and Breakers as well as farmlands, the Prison, and the fastest-growing residential zones in the country.	<p>The proposed indicative Area Plan boundaries are considered to be suitable since they reflect broad character areas although it is acknowledged that small amendments to the boundary lines could be considered. During Area Plan preparation the community/stakeholders may confirm Area Plan names.</p> <p>Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement also states that Area Plans will be developed for the indicative areas in collaboration with the people within the areas who will determine the needs and character they would like to see through zoning.</p>	
	6-126		This process held 2 of these planning meetings in the BT area (outer suburb) zone more than any other district is interesting in itself alone. BT is the second largest voting district after GT and therefore it should not be called a suburb as it is not a part of GT, unlike the inner suburb plan zone which just confuses the matter further.	Outer suburb was meant to be indicative of the fact that the area was outside of the major town centre of George Town and not expected to require intensive high capacity development. As also stated in Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement, Area Plans will be developed for the indicative areas in collaboration with the people within the areas who will determine the needs and character they would like to see through zoning.	
FF104	6-127		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF105	6-128		For little cayman, get our own development board.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-129		Pass our plan 1 st just to get some law and order here.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-130		No container homes.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	6-131		Protect our island before it is gone. Let our island stand different.	<p>The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to " maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development.</p> <p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p>	
	6-132		No more developers allowed here. Existing builders in.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	6-133		No more residential cutouts for mass houses.	<p>A stop order on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life.</p> <p>If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.</p>	
	6-134		We need containment tank or sewage help so it does not leak out to ocean.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
FF106	6-135			No Comment	
FF107	6-136		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF108	6-137		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF109	6-138		Overall, the Planning Statement leaves much still to be decided by the Area Plans. It is difficult to gauge the level of commitment to sustainable development without the detail.	Noted. The Planning Statement is a high-level document that defines the various Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations. These will be applied, with more detail, in each of the Area Plans.	
	6-139		The format of this survey makes it hard to leave comments without presenting them as objections, eg show support for the plan's intent to integrate more mixed use in communities across the island aligns well with sustainable development.	The survey contained a section labelled "Do you have any other feedback on the draft Planning Statement document?" which allowed for open-ended feedback.	
FF110	6-140		1.4 pg5 Area Plans Strongly object to South Sound / Walkers Road / Old Prospect being renamed or classified as Inner Suburb. 'Inner suburb' ordinarily reserved for cities does not take into account the 'village' character of the area.	<p>The proposed indicative Area Plan boundaries are considered to be suitable since they reflect broad character areas although it is acknowledged that small amendments to the boundary lines could be considered. During Area Plan preparation the community/stakeholders may confirm Area Plan names.</p> <p>Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement also states that Area Plans will be developed for the indicative areas in collaboration with the people within the areas who will determine the needs and character they would like to see through zoning.</p>	
	6-141		Specifically, a separate Area Plan needs to be carved out for the scenic coastal zone from South Church Street all the way along the coast to Old Crewe Road. This is an historic pathway steeped in history and a preferred tourist route for seeing the island. Categorising it to include increased development and density would ruin it's character.	<p>The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.</p> <p>Area Plans will also provide an opportunity for the consideration of appropriate locations / properties for inclusion within the Heritage Preservation Overlay.</p>	
	6-142		Cementaries should be honoured and preserved- the idea of moving coastal cementaries for development is egregious.	The Planning Statement does not imply moving coastal cemeteries in favour of development. Section 3.6(6) proposes that cemeteries be included within the Civic Zone.	
	6-143		2.2 Our key challenges are all based around population growth. Everyone knows that without a proper assessment of our population and an independent carrying capacity study this planning statement is an effort in futility to achieve sustainable growth.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF111	6-144			No Comment	
FF112	6-145		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF113	6-146			No Comment	
FF114	6-147		as before.		
FF115	6-148		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF116	6-149		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	6-150		1- The consultation period should be extended until the30 Sept 2024 and more meeting held.	<p>At its meeting of 14 August 2024 (CPA/21/24; item 3.1) the Authority was advised that representation was received from the West Bay Feedback Committee requesting the public consultation period be extended until September 30, 2024. The Authority considered the request and determined it could not be granted as to do so would be contrary to the provisions of Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision).</p> <p>All consultation events that were postponed due to Hurricane Beryl were rescheduled and advertised accordingly.</p>	
	6-151		2- Page 15 - 3.5west Bayers should not have to travel to George Town to have a vehicle tire changed. All districts need a industrial zone.	Noted. The Area Plan process will enable members of the community to suggest appropriate zoning for their area. Appropriately located light industrial zones and neighbourhood commercial zones would be encouraged. Section 3.5 of the Planning Statement indicates that the Authority shall ensure adequate long-term supply of industrial land to meet market demand and that this will be both within existing industrial areas as well as identifying areas suitable for locally-serving light industrial uses in outlying districts.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF117	6-152		3- page 22 - 4.6 The high water mark needs to be adjusted back to 1977, the vegetation for the beach coast and the right to pass on iron shore coast (Caymanians should be able to walk around the islands on the coast.	<p>The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.</p> <p>In 2021 Cabinet granted approval for a Government Technical Working Group to investigate the establishment of a Coastal Setback Reference Line for coastlines in the Cayman Islands. This will be determined through historical aerial imagery and the complementary development of a Coastal Category Setback map that considers shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations.</p>	
	6-153		4 - There needs to be a more effective way to notify the public of zone changes, construction etc.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-154		5- Page 9 - 2.9 Grand Cayman needs a reliable transport system and more roads will only create more traffic issues	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Sections 5.3.4 - incorporating infrastructure and transportation related design elements and 5.4 - supporting effective and efficient circulation and transportation. The Planning Statement is flexible and drafted to accommodate public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD.	
	6-155		6- Page 7 - where do Caymanians fit into the PlanCayman? Life is more the economics, over population cause many issues eg poor health, quality of life, lack of open space and crime	The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to " maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development.	
FF118	6-156		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF119	6-157		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF120	6-158		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF121	6-159		Little Cayman should be protected. No one should be allowed to fully clear a Lot of land.	<p>Noted. This is recognised in section 5.3 of the Planning Statement, in regard to subdivisions.</p> <p>If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.</p>	
	6-160		I personally will volunteer to walk around any lot in little that is being developed to save the air plants and orchids. Planning should make this a requirement before building commences. The Blossom development land , Needs the orchids removed before it can be bulldozed. I'm happy to do it.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-161		Little Cayman , should be kept low density with building height restrictions.	Setback and building heights will be considered at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	6-162		And most importantly restrictions on how a lot should be cleared	<p>Noted. This is recognised in section 5.3 of the Planning Statement, in regard to subdivisions.</p> <p>If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.</p>	
	6-163		Little Cayman needs an RO water plant to service the whole island.	Noted. Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.	
	6-164		And all 3 islands need recycling depots. In the sister islands all recycling can be loaded onto the empty barge each week. Single use plastic cups and water bottles should be banned in all hotels in the Cayman Islands especially LC	<p>Part of the role of each Area Plan is to provide more information of the infrastructure demands of each Area, and to further enable collaboration with infrastructure providers.</p> <p>A reference to recycling facilities is proposed for section 5.5</p> <p>The use of single-use plastics is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p>	Amend s.5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal facilities , <u>including recycling and composting facilities</u> ; "
	6-165		And there should never ever be any mosquito spraying between the airport and conch Club in Little. That entire line of trees along the pond has nesting boobies in them and we essentially fumigate them all the time , while pretending we care about them.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
FF122	6-166		Overall it has to be managed well and implemented properly . It has to be for the benefit of the people and not just to make certain members of the community richer	Noted.	
	6-167		The need of Little Cayman to be considered as a priority	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-168		and to have it's own planning board with proper enforcement is primordial.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF123	6-169		Even if not possible to make it all zones protected or the whole Island a National Park, it is crucial for the Cayman Islands to keep Little Cayman unique and "undeveloped", and to limitate the impact of development in the best sensitive way possible with Mother Nature. It may be the smallest of the 3 Cayman Islands, but is for sure the one where all the community memmbers and many regular visitors are very passionate about to keep (almost) as is.	Area Plans fall in the next stage which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF124	6-170		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF125	6-171		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF126	6-172		It seems that urban planning and development were not much of a consideration until now, and I worry that the precedent of allowing individuals or entities with significant wealth, money, and influence to develop as they wish has already been established. Many developments are built far too close to the waterline, and sea walls have destroyed parts of our pride and significant tourism economy, Seven Mile Beach. Until these sea walls are removed and sand is reintroduced, Grand Cayman will never enjoy the vast stretch of beach that used to exist at the northern end of the coastline.	The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.	
	6-173		Second, with finite land available, I believe it only makes sense for development to build up rather than sprawl over several acres. George Town businesses are already suffering from a lack of residential areas, mixed-use living and retail developments, and failed gentrification efforts.	<p>Certain locations may be suitable for increased density and smaller lot sizes, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.</p> <p>The Planning Statement supports strongly the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3. Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be discussed at the Area Plan phase and implemented via updating of the planning regulations.</p>	
	6-174		Alternative transportation, pedestrian routes, and pedestrian safety need to be made a priority. Laying more pavement, roads, asphalt, and parking lots only encourages a car culture and increases the physical temperature of these areas. In an already hot climate, the last thing we need is more pavement to raise the thermometer. The urban sprawl needs to stop,	<p>The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Sections 5.3.4 - incorporating infrastructure and transportation related design elements and 5.4 - supporting effective and efficient circulation and transportation. The Planning Statement is flexible and drafted to accommodate public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD.</p> <p>Certain locations may be suitable for increased density and smaller lot sizes, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses.</p> <p>The Planning Statement supports strongly the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3. Building heights are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be discussed at the Area Plan phase and implemented via updating of the planning regulations.</p>	
	6-175		and the number of vehicles imported to the island needs to be capped.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	6-176		Regarding undeveloped, privately owned land, an annual property tax for these landowners should be considered as a missing source of revenue, with stipulations for these parcels to be maintained, especially within residential neighborhoods, so they do not become overgrown dumping grounds harboring a multitude of pests.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	6-177		Lastly, for many health and environmental reasons that we are all aware of, the dump needs to be resolved and relocated with the utmost urgency, and a formal waste recycling plan needs to be mandated.	<p>Outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan.</p> <p>A reference to recycling facilities is proposed for section 5.5.</p>	Amend s.5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal facilities , <u>including recycling and composting facilities</u> ; "
FF127	6-178		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF128	6-179			No Comment	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF129	6-180		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF130	6-181		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF131	6-182		Please protect Little Cayman Island, and do not let it become the new Grand Cayman. Little Cayman is at it's carrying capacity. Further development will destroy the coral reefs, and island fauna.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF132	6-183		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF133	6-184		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF134	6-185		Agree with LCPRG feedback and especially endorse: •Request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized ...	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-186		and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman.....”	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
	6-187		“...Ideally having Little Cayman’s own Planning Board.”	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF135	6-188		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF136	6-189		Little Cayman Needs to have zoning laws and the voters / Caymanians who own land / property here should be the ones making these decisions.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF137	6-190		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF138	6-191		We would like to see LC placed as a priority since we have no plan. If Brac wants to be placed as a priority they should also be.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
FF139	6-192		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF140	6-193		Build a bridge over north sound	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
FF141	6-194		I believe I left my feedback on the previous remark Reinforcing the fact that we are all in agreement of having Planning Zones and Overlays, but needs to be done with sensitivity and respect of this special Island.	Comment noted.	
FF142	6-195		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF143	6-196		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF144	6-197		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF145	6-198			No Comment	
FF146	6-199		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF147	6-200		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF148	6-201		My late husband and I made L.C. Our home in [REDACTED] We landed safely on the DC-3 on the grass strip and many other planes without incident Please don’t move our Airport to another location it will ruin the uniqueness of L.C.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF149	6-202		To summarize my opinion, Little Cayman should have its own planning board. Zoning plans by the DCB is not appropriate for Little Cayman.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-203		Top priority should be protecting its natural environment and unspoiled character. Little Cayman is a unique Island amongst the three Islands. Every effort should be made to keep it that way.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF150	6-204			No Comment	
FF151	6-205		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF152	6-206			No Comment	
FF153	6-207			No Comment	
FF154	6-208		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF155	6-209		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF156	6-210		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
	6-211		Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the “CPA” and the Development Control Board is defined as the “DCB”. However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF157	6-212		General comment: The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. We hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is. We welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special.	Noted.	
	6-213		We would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-214		We also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, ideally having Little Cayman's own Planning Board.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-215		Also, we suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications, which pits neighbour against neighbour, relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-216		We noticed there is no discussion of 'grand-fathering' of existing rights of landowners to develop. We note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that 'Any person's existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations', which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of enjoyment and profit will be reduced.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	
	6-217		However, an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Comment noted.	
FF158	6-218		Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the "CPA" and the Development Control Board is defined as the "DCB". However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-219		The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. We hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is. We welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special.	Noted.	
	6-220		I would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-221		We also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, ideally having Little Cayman's own Planning Board.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF159	6-222		No Comment		
FF160	6-223		There are plans to build a new airport in Little Cayman in another location than the current one. This would be devastating to the Island. A lot of nature would be destroyed, It would be too costly, and it would alter the character of the Island drastically in a terrible way. All the reasons why people visit Little Cayman would be taken away in one blow. It's like killing the goose with the golden eggs. There is a better, cheaper and more ecological alternative: upgrade the current airport at it's current location. It would benefit and protect the island and it would be a fraction of the cost of a new airport at a new location.	Noted, however the potential relocation of the airport in Little Cayman is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of moving or keeping the airport at any given location. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
FF161	6-224		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF162	6-225		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
	6-226		On page 2, amend CPA to say "CPA or authority" and amend DCB to "DCB or the board" as these terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-227		Area plans should be prioritized for LC and Brac as they currently have no zoning.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF163	6-228		There needs to be separate District Committees for each sister island to help draft each island’s area plans.	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
	6-229		LC should have its own planning board to ensure consistency in decision making based on its unique priorities.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-230		Additional categories of objections should be allowed for LC.	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
FF164	6-231		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF165	6-232		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF166	6-233		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF167	6-234		Page 3, Introduction and page 11 Planning Zones - In principle, it is encouraging that Little Cayman be included in the National Development Plan. However, the type, scale, and pace of development that has occurred on Grand Cayman under the current 1997 Development Plan is manifestly unsuitable for Little Cayman. Little Cayman requires a fundamentally different premise for development and any plan must recognise the special nature and circumstances of Little Cayman and the intrinsic value of its natural capital. Proposed Area Plans outlined in the Draft Statement could provide sufficient differentiation and codification for Little Cayman’s requirements. The guidelines for Little Cayman contained in the 1977 Plan and carried over to the 1997 Plan in Appendix 2 have never been followed by the Development Control Board and the, DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW 1991, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE POLICIES AND ACTIONS FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN LITTLE CAYMAN by the Little Cayman District Advisory Committee was ignored and never implemented. These documents should serve as the basis for a potential Area Plan for Little Cayman.	Noted. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-235		General - The Draft Statement follows a planning philosophy that is completely reactive. This is set out in the Framework in the last paragraph of section 1.4. This is a fundamentally flawed starting point. There are material omissions of the Statement. Neither the Draft Statement nor the Framework provide any context for what healthy, desirable, and wise levels of development should be, the Draft Statement provides no analysis or determination of what aspects of the existing 1997 Plan have been successful and which have not in order to inform the Statement, and the Draft Statement does not define or list any sort of quantifiable metrics, data, and parameters to measure whether it’s Vision and Strategic Objectives are being achieved.	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private). Suggest changing title of section 1.6 to 'Goals', rather than strategic objectives. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	Amend section heading to 1.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES <u>GOALS</u> Also replace word 'objective' with 'goal' throughout section 1.6 and also in contents section
FF168	6-236		Issue #1 is Population! There is clearly a cargo, waste, pollution, deforestation, school space and traffic limit to population that we will run into again long before reaching even 120k. DON"’T TAKE US THERE! At the current rate, we'll be there in just a few years. Please ask CIG to assess our infrastructure capacity and cap population appropriately! If we're talking about planning construction it should begin with knowing our limits. It's past time to address the elephant in the room! Where and how we build what is of concern, but secondary to issue #1 if we're PLANNING.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-237		My pet peeve with CPA has long been that we have not yet adopted sane construction requirements for shoreline property, even by the wealthy, even after Ivan. Especially on a beach, anything built there should be on stilts for the safety of the structure, the proper movement ashore of sand and to reduce insurance costs for all of us, regardless where we build. Ivan reminded us where the storm surge goes, indicating that we should have increased height requirements or stilts in flood zones as well. Your office could inform customers about the zone their project is in and recommend the appropriate options for that risk.	The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans. The Planning Statement also introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay (section 4.6) to control development is highly vulnerable coastal areas and also seeks to review coastal setback requirements, which will be considered during Area Plan preparation.	
FF169	6-238		It doesn't go far enough to protect Little Cayman. Little Cayman should be seen as a special place to be preserved. There are currently no planning regulations for Little Cayman. It should be considered the most special of all three islands. It should be low volume, low density and low rise. Nothing over two stories. Nothing higher than the palm trees - just like it was in Grand Cayman until that got ruined. The whole island should become a national park of the utmost significance. We already have a world famous marine science station there (CCMI), pristine reefs and the area is currently being considered as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Think what our government could do with that cudos. It would make the Cayman Islands even more special to visit. Let's not ruin it.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights and density in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design and character requirements.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF170	6-239		Little Cayman should have its own planning board. Little Cayman should be prioritised for a plan. We currently have nothing protecting us from developers. It is critical something is done soon or we will be spoilt for good. Please do not let that happen.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-240		We need to be considered a special nature zone and have total protection for the entire island. Low density residential throughout. Low rise throughout (no more than two stories). Electric vehicles throughout (maybe eventually...). We have the chance to keep Little Cayman world class nature destination. Let's not ruin it.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-241		Little Cayman should be considered as a priority and treated differently because of its unique nature and reefs. Please don't wait until it is too late.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
FF171	6-242			No Comment	
FF172	6-243		Once again, on such a small island, the existence of traffic can be greatly reduced through proper planning and management of an infrastructural system that allows for safe usage of low impact modes of transport, such as public & active transit(walking, biking). Considerations for shade and a safely walkable neighbourhood, with appropriately placed businesses near enough to people in more urban settings to walk can have great effects on health and our economy, please see Amplify's presentation to the NRA from 2021 below from page 20 : https://www.amplifycayman.com/_files/ugd/76de65_48e545b948b146e78d3812cf4f230a74.pdf This presentation contains many great aspects	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability and promoting alternate forms of transportation as highlighted in Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement. The Area Plan approach will provide a mechanism for the community within in each area to have greater input into the Plan Review process. The Planning Statement also supports strongly the inclusion of commercial and community uses in residential spaces. This is supported via 'Neighbourhood Commercial' zones and mixed use developments as mentioned in Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.	
	6-244		Coastal set backs NEED to be properly respected. Time has shown the mistakes made by Planning on the south end of Seven Mile Beach. Anyone in a position of responsibility for these decisions should resign or be fired.	The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans. The Planning Statement also introduces a Sensitive Coastline Overlay (section 4.6) to control development is highly vulnerable coastal areas and also seeks to review coastal setback requirements, which will be considered during Area Plan preparation.	
FF173	6-245		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF174	6-246		Regenerative agriculture & Urban agriculture opportunities should be considered.	Section 3.2(5) of the draft Planning Statement promotes and supports alternative agriculture technologies and indicates that, subject to other considerations, such technologies may be permitted in Industrial and Commercial zones.	
	6-247		Consideration of community gardens?	Noted. While not specifically referenced in the draft Planning Statement, community gardens may be considered as 'open space or active/passive recreation facilities' required for major developments under s.5.9(3) of the draft Planning Statement.	
	6-248		Has consideration been made to increasingly buffers/minimum vegetation protection zones for natural heritage features including mangroves? Better protection is needed!!	The width of any Coastal Mangrove Buffer zone in any area shall be shown on the zoning map, and will be determined as part of each Area Plan. The purpose of the NRPO is to recognise other natural resources / sensitive landscapes / ecosystems and to identify additional considerations that the Authority/Board will take into account in decision-making. It is anticipated that these NRPO properties will be identified in consultation with the DoE and the community during the preparation of Area Plans. Certain elements of the natural resource may be recommended for protection from development.	
	6-249		Have Land securement opportunities been explored/considered? Land dedication?	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA.	
	6-250		conveyance of natural features through the development process/applications? Again in order to ensure protection.		
	6-251		Stronger Penalties for unauthorized site alteration/removals of environmental /Natural heritage features should be considered.	Provisions for enforcement will fall within the remit of the Compliance Unit within the Department of Planning.	
	6-252		What is the ecological Compensation methodology protocol for authorized environmental/natural feature removal?	Enforcement and Penalties for conservation offences fall under Part 6 of the National Conservation Act. Section 4.2 of the Planning Statement indicates that mitigation measures could be applied, where necessary, to offset development impacts. The exact nature of these mitigation measures is yet to be determined.	
FF175	6-253		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF176	6-254		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF177	6-255		Coastal Zone Management is blatantly favouring developers and not the environment! I beg you to think of your children's children when you are writing this plan!	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF178	6-256		Please see general comments below: Great idea to have Planning Zones and Overlays.	Noted	
	6-257		We need the Area Plan to be a priority for Little Cayman please.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-258		We also need our own Planning Board and proper enforcement.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-259		Keep Little Special, low density, low rise. Consider making the whole island a National Park.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF179	6-260			No Comment	
FF180	6-261		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF181	6-262		Drafting comment on page 2: On page 2 amend “(“CPA”)” to say (“CPA” or “Authority”) and amend “(“DCB”)” to say “(“DCB or the Board”)” Explanation: Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the “CPA” and the Development Control Board is defined as the “DCB”. However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-263		General comment: The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. We hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is. We welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special.	Noted	
	6-264		We would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-265		We also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-266		Also, we suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications, which pits neighbour against neighbour, relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	6-267		We noticed there is no discussion of ‘grand-fathering’ of existing rights of landowners to develop. We note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that ‘Any person’s existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations’, which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of enjoyment and profit will be reduced.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	
	6-268		However, the LCPRG believes an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Noted	
	6-269		Drafting comment on page 2: On page 2 amend “(“CPA”)” to say (“CPA” or “Authority”) and amend “(“DCB”)” to say “(“DCB or the Board”)” Rationale: There seems to be inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the “CPA” and the Development Control Board is defined as the “DCB”. However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-270		General comments: The Planning Statement is well written and long overdue. It is my hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament. I welcome the Area Plans being added as all three islands are unique and I look forward to Little Cayman having its own.	Noted	
	6-271		Having personal experience with the lack of a defined Development Plan for Little Cayman, I would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF182	6-272		I would also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future. I realize both of these comments are ultimately the responsibility of the government.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-273		Again with personal experience I would suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications from the Planning Board on proposed plans, which relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement	
	6-274		Finally, there is no discussion of ‘grand-fathering’ of existing rights of landowners to develop. Note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that ‘Any person’s existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations’, which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of profit will be reduced.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	
	6-275		However, an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Noted	
FF183	6-276		In regards to section 6 referring to further development of roads, it should be considered that Cayman has grown too quickly. Section 6 does consider the idea of public transportation. But instead of adding more roads to sustain the growing population of not only workers, but also students, it would be beneficial to have a properly functioning, bus and taxi program that could also benefit tourists. There needs to be a clearer plan of how this would be possible, not only seeking “potential” to promote it. There is very little within section 6 that includes public transportation instead of removing more land to our roads to support more gas fueled cars, public transportation should be at the forefront of this planning statement.	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4. The Planning Statement supports effective and efficient circulation and transportation and is flexible to support public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-277		Section 7.5 does review the fact that stormwater and drainage does need to be considered during planning of new developments. However, to support sustainable development and more specifically the use of stormwater as its drainage it should be looked at that there are new and more efficient ways of draining water as well as preventing flooding specifically in areas such as eastern Avenue and Windsor Park. To put it more simply reducing the use of concrete on flat areas and promoting a drainage system that takes water clarifies it and purifies it for reuse in areas where water could easily cause flooding would be a sustainable plan. This has been observed in countries, such as Bermuda, where water is used from not only storms but simple rainfall and has prevented much of their flooding. Aside from the fact that they do have more hills than the Cayman Islands.	We await a comprehensive stormwater and drainage study by the NRA which will then be factored into the development plan when completed.	
	6-278		Section 11. Five reviews the idea of adding to the spots terminal while it is understood that we have an increasing amount of cruise tourists. But as seen with our most recent port referendum, it should be considered that Caymanians are not in favor of adding to the degradation of our coastal reefs. If it is proposed to add to the already large spots towards terminal, it should be clearly defined how this would not ruin the coastal area.	Comment appears to be a reference the National Planning Framework. Any works related to Spotts terminal is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	6-279		In conclusion, it should also be noted that there is a lack of clarity between the Cayman Islands Government and Caymanians to see their views on the development of their Islands. Many developments that have been built have not had the full consideration of Caymanian interest, and more specifically Caymanian future. While many pieces of legislation have been gazetted before being passed, they have not been promoted for Caymanians to review. This has caused the enforcement of legislation that Caymanians may not understand at face value. It is only as of recent, that Caymanians have seemingly had a say, in reviewing legislation. It may also be advised that the government has more outreach with their legal counsel to provide legal education to Caymanians in reading, and understanding the bills that are trying to be passed.	All stages of PlanCayman are prepared in full consultation with the public.	
FF184	6-280		Little Cayman should have have the Area Plan prioritized given that it does not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-281		Little Cayman should have its own Planning Board so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-282		This is great (and once in a lifetime) chance to get this right for Little Cayman and protect the natural environment and everything that makes Little Cayman so special for both residents and visitors.	Noted, the Area Plan for Little Cayman will provide an opportunity for residents to determine the priorities for the island.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF185	6-283		General comments: 5.2 PADs -inappropriate for Little Cayman given Little Cayman’s needs and goals.	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	6-284		5.3 Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of ‘land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent’ (page 23).	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
	6-285		5.4 Circulation and Transportation – encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	6-286		Discourage cars, trucks and speeding. This is already supported by the current maximum speed limit on Little Cayman (25), which serves the island’s sensitive endemic species like the Sister Islands Rock Iguana and should remain.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	6-287		5.5 Infrastructure – consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island and improving cell service to the north side for emergency response.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-288		Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc.	Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement sets out the elements of infrastructure that are supported by the Authority and Board. The implementation of individual infrastructure projects is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-289		Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the Little Cayman landfill, the runoff of which has already visibly effected the marine environment in dive sites in the Bight, is minimised.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal <u>and recycling facilities</u> ";
	6-290				
	6-291		5.6 Design – aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two habitable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency). Prohibit container homes. Aim for all buildings to have Caribbean character.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	6-292		5.7 Natural resources and coastline – seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-293		5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.	
	6-294		Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands?	The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	6-295		Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-296		5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation for features not requested by the local Little Cayman population. In Little Cayman, minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand and when necessary small equipment) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	6-297		5.10 Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive, low volume, and low key, in support of recreational, low-density diving, fishing, birdwatching, and nature trail use. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-298		5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-299		Other feedback: Drafting comment on page 2: On page 2 amend “(“CPA”)” to say “(“CPA” or “Authority”)” and amend “(“DCB”)” to say “(“DCB or the Board”)” Explanation: Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the “CPA” and the Development Control Board is defined as the “DCB”. However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-300		General comment: The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. Along with the Little Cayman community, I hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is.	Noted.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-301		I welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special. I would like to request that Little Cayman has their Area Plans prioritized given that we do not have any zoning at all, and because the task will be relatively manageable given the size of the island and its singular, natural environment character.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-302		A District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
	6-303		I also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-304		Also, I suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications, which pits neighbour against neighbour, relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-305		There is no discussion of ‘grand-fathering’ of existing rights of landowners to develop. I note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that ‘Any person’s existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations’, which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of enjoyment and profit will be reduced.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	
	6-306		However, the Little Cayman community believes an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Noted	
FF186	6-307		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF187	6-308		<p>This is not as much feed back on the document as it is a testimony of the reasons Little Cayman needs its own Development Plan, Zoning Laws, and Tourism Plan. The island has gone far too long without these guard rails to help guide the communities development. First, 74.2% of the shoreline, out to 45 M deep, around Little Cayman is designated marine protected areas by the Cayman Islands government. This is internationally significant and puts Little Cayman’s land and marine protected areas well above the UN’s suggested 30 x 30 goal – protect 30% by 2030. If legally protected land and shoreline were combined, 47.4% of the land/sea shelf is protected. This is significant and is one of the reasons Little Cayman is now in consideration for UNESCO World Heritage Status. Little Cayman holds unique and outstanding universal value for its uncommon geological features, vibrant and protected marine ecosystem, and home for endangered species. Its geological features include its plunging reef walls: if the island were to rise above the sea, the granite face of the wall would rival the world’s greatest mountain peaks. Little Cayman’s marine health, biodiversity, and protection of so many endangered species of Marine flora and fauna inspired Dr Sylvia Earl to declare the sea around Little Cayman a Mission Blue Hope Spot in 2021. The island’s unique biodiversity is also visible on land. Little Cayman provides habitat for fully 1/3 of the Caribbean’s population of seagoing red-footed boobies (Sula sula). The Island’s Booby Pond Nature Reserve is a Ramsar Wetland of International Significance and is protected by the 2021 National Conservation Law. Its unique Tarpon Pond is also nationally protected. Given the unique natural assets that are found on Little Cayman it is vital that a productive and protective balance be found between business interests and growth while protecting our natural heritage. Little Cayman is a jewel in the Cayman Crown. It is a shining compliment to Cayman Brac and Grand Cayman. Importantly, it is the last accessible island in the western hemisphere that holds the old time adventure and cultural values of the region. It is the Caribbean, the way it used to be.</p>	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF188	6-309		All in all it is a very detailed and well written document and we look forward to the next steps of this process. Thank you!	Noted	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF189	6-310		AS STATED ON PAGE 2, OF THE PLANNING STATEMENT: "THE 1997 PLAN ONLY INCLUDED APPENDICES WHICH OFFERED GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL OF THE SISTER ISLANDS. AS SUCH THERE IS STILL NO PLAN IN PLACE FOR EITHER CAYMAN BRAC AND LITTLE CAYMAN. THE NEW PLAN SEEKS TO FINALLY INCLUDE GUIDANCE FOR ALL THREE ISLANDS" THE FACT THAT LITTLE CAYMAN STILL DOES NOT HAVE A PLAN, AND IS THEREFORE A BLANK CANVAS WHEN IT COMES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR LITTLE CAYMAN, I FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT PLANNING, AREA AND OVERLAY ZONING, NEED TO BE PUT IN PLACE WITH UTMOST PRIORITY. IF ONLY TWO DISTRICTS A YEAR ARE TO BE LOOKED AT, OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT LITTLE CAYMAN AND CAYMAN BRAC SHOULD BE THE FIRST TWO DISTRICTS. A LOT CAN HAPPEN IN FIVE YEARS, AND LITTLE CAYMAN CANNOT AFFORD TO BE LEFT BEHIND ANY FURTHER WITHOUT A PLAN FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-311		I ALSO THINK THAT LITTLE CAYMAN NEEDS IT'S ONLY PLANNING BOARD AND DISTRICT COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE THE GROWTH OF THE ISLAND AND PRESERVATION OF ITS UNIQUENESS, AS THE LAST "ISLAND THAT TIME FORGOT". LITTLE CAYMAN SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE PLANNING BOARD, TO CAYMAN BRAC.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF190	6-312		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION		
FF191	6-313		There is a lot of concern on Little Cayman about "roads to nowhere," that is, land cleared for subdivisions that go unsold. I would urge the Development Control Board to consider that, and not approve future subdivisions. There is already plenty of cleared land available for sale.	Noted. This is recognised in section 5.3 of the Planning Statement, in regard to subdivisions. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.	
FF192	6-314		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF193	6-315		The unique environment of Little Cayman should be recognised in its own Area Plan and land use plan with a smaller subsets of zones - excluding High Density Residential Zones, limited commercial zones, no heavy industrial except to the extent needed for the power requirements of the islands and excluding Hotel Tourism zones (but allowing limited Neighbourhood and resort zones). Overlay zones should be applied sensitively. NRPO and SCO should be applied consistently to all land adjacent to or with drainage/run of into National Park areas.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights and density in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design and character requirements.	
	6-316		A separate planning board consisting of residents and property owners in Little Cayman should be established	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-317		rigorous application of height and density policies as well as environmental building practices should be implemented.	Noted. This will be addressed at the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan	
	6-318		We should seek to make Little Cayman the Harbour Island of the Cayman Islands	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF194	6-319		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Planning Statement. I wish for Little Cayman to have their own Area Plans, District Committee, and Planning Board. Thank you	Noted. The Planning Statement is drafted to incorporate all 3 islands whilst factoring in flexibility, acknowledging that each island will have unique needs. PlanCayman also proposes separate Area Plans for each of the Sister Islands to meet the particular needs of each of those places. The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF195	6-320		On page 2 amend "(CPA)" to say "(CPA" or "Authority") and amend "(DCB)" to say "(DCB or the Board)" Explanation: Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the "CPA" and the Development Control Board is defined as the "DCB". However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-321		General comment: The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. We hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is. We welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special.	Noted.	
	6-322		We would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-323		and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community.	
	6-324		We also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-325		Also, we suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications, which pits neighbour against neighbour, relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-326		We noticed there is no discussion of 'grand-fathering' of existing rights of landowners to develop. We note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that 'Any person's existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations', which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of enjoyment and profit will be reduced. However, the LCPRG believes an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	
FF196	6-327		Little Cayman Area Plan should be the first one to put in place.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-328		Little Cayman should have its own planning board.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-329		Little Cayman should be low rise, low density throughout.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights and density in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design and character requirements.	
FF197	6-330		It's a great idea to have Planning Zones and Overlays.	Noted	
	6-331		Please make the Area Plan a priority for the Sister Islands, and ideally include a District Committee made inclusive of individuals in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-332		Additionally, I truly believe that each island should have a planning board unique to that island that includes residents/individuals who spend lots of time on the islands who can speak on behalf of their communities and are knowledgeable of and invested in their present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
FF198	6-333		As individuals have pointed out during consultation meetings, I second that there is a great need for rental regulation and housing development policies that will ensure everyone in the Cayman Islands can afford to pay rent and can afford to live in a safe, comfortable environment.,	Rental regulation is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-334		Furthermore, a transportation network plan for public transportation should be at the forefront of this development planning statement. Public transportation is the proven solution for reducing traffic times and it is what a majority of people want in the Cayman Islands. It would improve mobility for youth and elderly alike and open up spaces for cultural development, as opposed to building more parking lots. I want to see the previous reflecting in my country's planning statement	The Planning Statement will support alternative forms of transportation and promote walkability as highlighted in Section 5.4. The Planning Statement supports effective and efficient circulation and transportation and is flexible to support public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-335		in addition to safeguarding the culture and economies of the Sister Islands, which have had little to no mention despite large infrastructure projects being passed there.	The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to " maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF199	6-336		No Comment		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF200	6-337		No doubt more input could be given, however, even though CIG through Planning may think that more than sufficient time has been given for public input, UNFORTUNATELY the CIG has inundated the public with a number of other important issues, including but not limited to the CARGO PORT development plus of course again raising the issue of a CRUISE PORT et cetera. Understandably although most of us realize that each of these issues require careful consideration, there is no question that it is unfair and inconsiderate of CIG to overwhelm the electorate by throwing all of these issues on the table simultaneously, knowing that (intentionally or otherwise) as too happens, too many will throw their hands up in the air in despair and say what's the use of giving input, because CIG will do what it wants anyway.	The consultation period observed was in keeping with the Development and Planning Act (2021 revision). The structure of PlanCayman which has been separated into Area Plans allows for a process of continuous community engagement.	
FF201	6-338		Thank you very much. I know a lot of hard work went into producing the Draft Planning Statement. I viewed one meeting online and attended another and at both meetings, you were all very gracious, patient and explained everything very well. This memory just popped into my head. When the delegation came to Cayman Brac to discuss the first Development Plan, they met with polite resistance. The next morning, one of the delegates discovered that someone had slipped a note under the door of his hotel room. It said – Grand Cayman, have your Plan. We don't care what you do, just let us paddle our own canoe! The rest is history.	Noted. One of the reasons for introducing separate Area Plans is to enable each area such as Cayman Brac to have policies that are more appropriate for each location.	
FF202	6-339		I lived in Little Cayman for 8 years, I consider it my happy place. I met wonderful people and made wonderful memories there. The community in Little Cayman is like a Family. Watching over 20 turtles just swim around every evening became so common that you don't even think that it is a privilege to still be able to witness that in the present day. Little Cayman is not just a National Treasure of the Cayman Islands, but of the world.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF203	6-340		Section 5. We do not wish for any PADS on Cayman Brac except for a National Preserve on the eastern end of Cayman Brac as I've mentioned before in this survey.	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	6-341		The bluff lighthouse plateau a natural 'thatch walk' and a totally different landscapes than the rest of the Brac and the highest point in the Cayman Islands that offer killer views over the Caribbean Sea and draws many tourist and local alike to its edge. The edge of this area also offers home to the booby birds nests living area. The north side of this plateau traditional walking trail which was made in history when the elders would drag fuel cylinders to power the lighthouse before it was converted to solar should be protected and maintained. On the lowland the keys that have fishing history for the Caymanian Brackers and adventurous hikes for tourism. Recently the booby birds have taking to nesting on Long Beach by the keys so should also be protected.	<p>The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.</p> <p>The Planning Statement introduces the NRPO section 4.2 which seeks to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources.</p>	
	6-342		General comments: 5.2 PADs -inappropriate for Little Cayman given Little Cayman's needs and goals.	PlanCayman provides the policies and considerations that will be applied when PADs are proposed. Whether PADs are appropriate in each area will be consulted on during the Area Plan phase of the Development Plan process.	
	6-343		5.3 Subdivisions – request the DCB place a moratorium on any further ones until infrastructure issues such as waste treatment are addressed. Also request better enforcement of 'land clearing should be reserved until development of individual parcels is imminent' (page 23).	<p>A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life.</p> <p>If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan.</p>	
	6-344		5.4 Circulation and Transportation – encourage bikes, electric bikes and electric vehicles.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	6-345		Discourage cars, trucks and speeding. This is already supported by the current maximum speed limit on Little Cayman (25), which serves the island's sensitive endemic species like the Sister Islands Rock Iguana and should remain.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement sets out broad policies for alternative forms of transportation. Any particular requirements for Little Cayman can be included in the Area Plan.	
	6-346		5.5 Infrastructure – consider completing the paved road to the north-east of the island and improving cell service to the north side for emergency response.	Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement sets out the elements of infrastructure that are supported by the Authority and Board. The implementation of individual infrastructure projects is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-347		Note self-sufficiency versus central water, waste etc. Encourage recycling, composting, dump management policies to tackle pests (flies) and vermin and encourage removal of recyclables and large items such as rusty cars and containers off the island so that the Little Cayman landfill, the runoff of which has already visibly effected the marine environment in dive sites in the Bight, is minimised.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: "3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal <i>and recycling facilities</i> ";

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF204	6-348		5.6 Design – aim for buildings to be aesthetically in keeping and low rise (maximum of two habitable storeys above a ground floor covered area for example, to allow for a two storey home to be on stilts for wash through/flooding and climate resiliency). Prohibit container homes. Aim for all buildings to have Caribbean character.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design requirements.	
	6-349		5.7 Natural resources and coastline – seek to limit building above the treeline along the beach of South Hole, and only one storey above the mangroves in the Kingston Bight area. The mangroves in this area should have a Sensitive Coastline Overlay.	The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-350		5.8 Water lenses – has there been a hydrological survey of Little Cayman done? If not then it might be difficult to implement the ideas in this section. In the absence of such a survey, the impact of multiple septic tanks possibly contaminating the water lenses in Little Cayman should be a consideration when considering the volume of future applications.	Consultation with the Water Authority will be a key component of all stages in the Development Plan review.	
	6-351		Aggregate excavation is mentioned on page 28 at number 4 – what studies have been done into limiting the impact of quarrying on the Islands? Encourage eg glass recycling to generate construction sand instead.	The CPA is guided by the Aggregate Policy (2004) and advise from the Aggregate Advisory Committee (AAC).	
	6-352		5.9 Parks, Recreation and Open Space – Large fields for sporting activity mean large scale clearing of vegetation for features not requested by the local Little Cayman population. In Little Cayman, minimal clearing should be permitted (preferably by hand and when necessary small equipment) and nature trails should be encouraged instead.	Noted. The particular needs and demands of each community will be determined within each Area Plan. Section 5.9 of the Planning Statement indicates this with reference to recreation facilities.	
	6-353		5.10 Economy – page 29 mentions supporting finance, tourism, retail, commerce and industrial industries to thrive. Of those categories, only tourism is relevant to Little Cayman, and that should be eco-sensitive, low volume, and low key, in support of recreational, low-density diving, fishing, birdwatching, and nature trail use. The retail and commerce categories would only be in a supporting role for tourism. Construction should not be considered an industry in itself as it is in Grand.	Noted. The Other Policy Considerations in the Planning Statement do not reference specific islands but are general and comprehensive to encompass usage in all three islands, where appropriate. At the next step of the Development Plan process, Area Plans will be created which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
	6-354		5.11 Add a policy for Crown land usage, acquisition and disposal for transparency, respect for the environment and anti-corruption.	The introduction of the Land Subject to Acquisition Overlay (LSAO) is intended to provide more transparency about property that Government intends to acquire for a range of uses. The usage and disposal of these lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
FF205	6-355		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF206	6-356		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF207	6-357		It is a document full of "feel good" statements but lacking in any solid substance that will change or affect the status quo which today is that with enough money, land use will succumb to the desires of whoever holds the purse, such as developers and real estate speculators. The plan is full of loopholes and ways that those with resources (lawyers, money, time) can exploit to - in time - basically ruin the natural beauty of the Cayman Islands.	Noted. The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-358		At some point a plan must emerge that realizes that these islands cannot continue to develop, develop, develop, build, build, build, more and more people. A plan that takes on the challenge of designed stagnation, yes stagnation or full stop of land destruction, reduce and eventually stop or decline population growth while still maintaining economic growth will be needed sooner or later, hopefully long before the islands run out of space and no longer able to sustain the pressure of overpopulation.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-359		This plan is not that but punts that ball further down the road, doing nothing concrete to curb the destruction of the natural beauty of these islands.	The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to "maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development. The next phase of the Development Plan process will facilitate the creation of Area Plans which will detail zoning, ultimately determining the character of the indicative areas in collaboration with the people of the Cayman Islands.	
FF208	6-360		With continued rapid development in Grand Cayman it will be impossible to provide adequate infrastructure for roads, transport, ports, schools, hospitals, water, wastewater, electricity generation and distribution and airports. The Statement does not address this and seems to assume that the infrastructure will keep up with the growth	PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. The Area Plan approach will identify the infrastructure needs of each community in collaboration with infrastructure service providers.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF209	6-361		While the plan mentions a growing population, I am of the opinion that population growth needs to be curtailed as there are too many people and too many vehicles on the island at present.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
FF210	6-362		The Cayman Islands Development Plan should prioritise Caymanians over all other foreign interests and influences. This plan needs to be specific and written according to the traditions and values of Caymanians with no room private interests to dilute the ethnic identity of the Caymanian people. Whether that be from a social, economic or cultural perspective. Ultimately, the structure of the planning statement seems good, but its general context needs to be more specific and not have any leeway for capital developers that may propose major developments that takes away from what it is to be and feel Caymanian. And with development to continue, as stated in the plan it is to be sustainable and for the utmost benefit of the Caymanian people. Not just the respective investors and their private interests who in some instances have gentrified and segregated Caymanians from their ancestral priveledges and sense of being and belonging in their home country the Cayman Islands.	The Planning Statement is a comprehensive document that seeks to " maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands" and "safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people". The Planning Statement is balanced and is not solely focused on economics or development. The Plan represents the needs of the whole community. Noted. The inclusion of Caymanian Heritage can be incorporated into the Vision (section 1.5)	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: "Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic -social and -environmental and economic outcomes, while safeguarding Caymanian Heritage , the culture, and the health and general welfare of its people."
FF211	6-363		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF212	6-364		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF213	6-365		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF214	6-366		The Planning Statement is an excellent document. In addition there should be - perhaps at 3.3 or at 5.10 the mention of preservation of access to properties bought with access defined, yet years later (perhaps after changing ownership) the current owner finds he/she has no access to it, contrary to its registration.	Issues relating to Easements and Rights of Way are under the remit of the Lands and Survey Department.	
	6-367		Government (NRA?) should be mandated to restore the access that went missing. Also there needs to be government involvement for a lot owner to record expectation for an adjacent owner of a property that may be undeveloped (or even an undeveloped LPP) to clear or look after a corridor adjacent to the occupied lot.	Under s.29A of the Development and Planning Act the Authority has power to require proper maintenance of land if the amenity of an area is adversely affected or seriously injured by reason of the ruinous, dilapidated or other condition of any building, structure, fence or wall, or by the condition of land due to the deposit of refuse, spoil or derelict vehicles or equipment, or the occupation of land or a road for purposes of the repair of vehicles or equipment	
FF215	6-368		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	
FF216	6-369		Yes, please my goodness include metrics of success and clear goals you would like to strive for. Right now, it's very blanket and vague with no real indicators that you know how to address all these needs and their competing interests. How do you plan to balance the need for development vs protecting the environment and heritage sites? How do you envision providing housing options and availabilities with no real vision for how public transit or other encompassing infrastructure is need i.e. third spaces for families and young persons. How do you plan to balance out the needs of private developers and the needs of the general public when it comes to development? I would HIGHLY encourage those reading this to consider working alongside persons who are working on the housing strategy, get involved in the talks of public transportation reform and the like. If you want this to be successful, it is best to cover all bases and demonstrate to the public you do have an idea what direction you would like to go in. Because from initial conversations of the public consultations, persons in this community are skeptical of anything that is put forward especially when it doesn't show there is any clear direction. It's nice that there are objectives, but in what priority are you putting them in? Is tourism more important than housing? Is allowing the agricultural community more important than public transport? Is developing industrial and commercial areas more important than protecting our biodiversity? Food for thought. I could say more but you would need to pull up with hot tea and glasses. Just REALLY think this through.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Area Plans will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights, density, environmental protection, accessibility, open spaces, etc. in the island in all zones. Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc and will be prepared in consultation with government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private).	
	6-370		Thank you for giving us the opportunity for this. I hope considerations will be given to environmental protections, wildlife movements, accessibility, safety, the creation of green belts and bridges that will help connect the nature across the island.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Various sections of the Planning Statement include policies relating to environmental issues, including section 3.9 (Coastal Mangrove Buffer), section 4.2 (NRPO) and section 5.7 (Natural Resources and Coastline)	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
FF217	6-371		I know Little Cayman community is worried about over development.	The Little Cayman Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define maximum building heights and density in the island in all zones, and to determine any other locally-appropriate design and character requirements.	
	6-372		The Brac and Grand have key cave systems that have not been full understood.	Noted. A reference to caves is suggested for section 2.4, and areas for inclusion within the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay can be considered within each Area Plan.	Amend s2.4, as follows: "The Cayman Islands boast a variety of natural features such as forests, shrublands, mangrove s and freshwater wetlands ,caves,sinkholes and scenic coastlines which provide unique benefits to the country's economy, society , culture and biodiversity."
	6-373		There needs to be connectivity of these green spaces, else we will see more road kills and wildlife encounters with people.	Areas for inclusion within the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay can be considered within each Area Plan. In addition, section 5.3 of the Planning Statement states that plans of subdivision must conform to the zoning requirements of the land to which they relate and should embrace the natural environment by retaining natural vegetation, key landscape features, and environmentally significant elements.	
	6-374		There needs to be sustainable development, in the Cayman Islands and I hope this plan will help and not be too late to reverse the damage done.	Noted. The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
FF218	6-375		This whole document lacks detail and explanation. It feels like an outline or summary, when this is supposed to be the more detailed document from the planning framework. Each section lists all these goals and actions that will be done, but there is no actual how, when, or why behind them. I suggest Plan Cayman cross references other islands planning statements such as Jersey Island, with half our land size and a population not much bigger than ours at 107,000. Their plan is over 300 page long, offers explanations and options, public opinion, and a much stronger evaluation and consideration of effects of climate change. This proposed planning statement does not change much from our current development trajectory, and if we do not change soon to encompass the effects of climate change and our ever growing population (which we also have no plan for) we will not have the space, or possibility even the island to support our people. We cannot continue to create a planning statement operating in silos- all ministries of our government must come together to fulfill action and promises to protect our future generations and our island. I suggest Planning revises this statement to include far more detail and policy instead of its current use of actionless "sustainability" buzzwords.	The Planning Statement is one stage in the wider PlanCayman Development Plan review and the purpose of the document is to define various Zones, Overlays and Policy Considerations that will be applied with more detail in subsequent phases of the Plan; Area Plans. Each Area Plan will be prepared in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
FF219	6-376		We are at a crossroads. The future of our islands depend on having an idea of what kind of country we want to be. Going out to the public to ask what do you want your community to look like is a nice idea but YOU are the city planners. Why aren't Government agency experts taking part more significantly in this process?	An important aspect of town planning is public input, and is also a requirement under the Development and Planning Act. It is intended that the information received from the public consultations will help to inform future drafts and the subsequent phases of the Development Plan.	
	6-377		Overall, I would like to see a Plan that places sustainable development at the centre.	Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement defines sustainable development as, "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
	6-378		Our islands are so small. Population growth is exploding by the day and bringing all of the socio-economic and environmental pressures with it.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-379		A new development plan - and even the statement - needs to have a more concrete framework for what it wants achieve and HOW it intends to achieve it. I see very little of that here. Ensuring our islands grow at a manageable pace that considers how are infrastructure and environment can sustain the population is at the core of this project and yet, where is the commitment to a robust legislative framework that MANDATES specific sustainable development practices to protect coastal properties, protect our nesting sea turtle beaches, provide parks and green spaces for public use, respect the National Conservation Act, ensure new buildings are working WITH communities and the environment not against them, and overall placing our beautiful Cayman Islands ahead of property owner bias.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	
	6-380		You can't just keep saying, "it not illegal so it's ok". I'd like to see a Plan with some backbone to create beautiful communities built INTO nature, not to spite it. One that ensures a true balance of development that respects our National Conservation Act and the incredible stress our growing population is having on our islands. Please help build Cayman into something we can be truly proud of and not just another concrete island.	The Planning Statement introduces high level policies that relate to some of these issues. Where more details are required for a specific Area, this will be addressed in subsequent phases of the Plan Review in consultation with relevant department/agencies and stakeholders (public/private).	
FF220	6-381		Please see my previous comment regarding the Committee for each Area Plan. Also I agree that the Area Plans should be prioritized - don't attempt to do every Area Plan all at all once!	Noted. A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan process. All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken with full public consultation of the whole community. Currently, it is intended for the Area Plans to be prepared in a cascading approach which will allow for continuous community engagement in the process.	
FF221	6-382		Section 1.4 pg 5 Fig 1.2 Why is the Bodden Town area named the Outer Suburb? Is the Planning Departments intention to prevent commercial, industrial or institutional zones to be developed around the BT area? Suburb implies an area with minimal activities, mainly residential. How will that impact a balanced infrastructure development on the island.	<p>The proposed indicative Area Plan boundaries are considered to be suitable since they reflect broad character areas although it is acknowledged that small amendments to the boundary lines could be considered. During Area Plan preparation the community/stakeholders may confirm Area Plan names.</p> <p>Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement also states that Area Plans will be developed for the indicative areas in collaboration with the people within the areas who will determine the needs and character they would like to see through zoning. Sections 3.4 and 3.5 of the Planning Statement note that commercial and industrial uses may be appropriate in outlying districts to serve local communities.</p>	
FF222	6-383			No Comment	
FF223	6-384		Land zones for first time Caymanians buyers should be zoned. These lands must be availalbe when student whom are entering the workforce and or leaving there parental home.	The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions for all income levels with mixed used developments and vibrant town/city centres (work spaces). The Planning Statement, the DoP and CPA are not responsible for conducting affordable housing needs studies but to create a Development Plan that will support these polices when they are brought forward. Kindly note, the Ministry of Planning, Agriculture, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport and Development (PAHITD) launched a comprehensive survey aimed at gathering valuable insights to inform the development of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan.	
FF224	6-385		in the eastern districts agricultural roads and gazetted by Boundary Plans and constructed but no finalized as public roads by PCM.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR1-A	6-386		<p>Regulation 20 of the Development and Planning Regulations (2020 Revision) clearly states that it is the duty of the Central Planning Authority to ensure that scenic shoreline land is preserved which would include the scenic views along the coast line.</p> <p>The Cayman Islands are blessed with many scenic views. These views are being destroyed during our rapid pace of development. There is the need for identification and protection of these important scenic assets. Certain outstanding natural, cultural and recreational values for the enjoyment of the present and future generations need to be preserved. There is the need to preserve the special character of the coast line views, beaches and important scenic views. The Cayman Islands Government and our elected representatives are failing to do so. Now it is time for us the people to demand that this be done.</p> <p>The scenic views are sections that are free of development and need to be recognized for intrinsic qualities, cultural, historic, natural recreational and scenic. These road side views are and should be established by a scenic list registered by legislation and gazetted to preserve and protect the islands scenic roads and promote tourism and economic development. They need to be administered for example by the NRA . In so doing there must be community involvement to identify all scenic views in the Cayman Islands which would include beaches as well. We have scenic beach areas and service roads for example The Mary Mollie Hydes Road, the only place now where you can see the entire seven mile beach, other areas being Smith Barcadere, Governor's Beach, Barkers and many others which need that type of protection. The only way to permanently protect scenic views from development is to purchase parcels of lands or future easements for the benefit of the public, which must state to be held for the benefit in trust of the public. (i.e. for the people of the Cayman Islands).</p> <p>Regulatory guidelines/laws must be put in place for their protection especially that such scenic areas will lead to the accrual of substantial benefits that will increase tourism value. Other countries have in place such protection to enhance and preserve their natural resources.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is now to demand the Cayman Islands Government and the Elected Representatives to implement scenic protection legislation to protect the unique views from pressure of development so as not to allow the loss of such important views that exist in the islands. We should not forget that these islands were known for their wonderful natural beauty and this should not be totally sacrificed for the sake of concrete buildings.</p>	<p>The Planning Statement will not only support appropriate setbacks in coastal areas but will also seek to maintain coastal panoramic views and vistas (section 5.7 of the draft Planning Statement). Specific setbacks and building heights will be addressed in the Area Plans.</p> <p>The acquisition of lands is outside the scope of the Planning Statement, although section 4.5 would seek to record such properties within an Overlay to aid transparency.</p>	
	6-387				
WR1-B	6-388		<p>At the meeting in West Bay the subject of Scenic Views came up. It was said/answered that at page 24 of the Cayman Islands Development Plan Scenic Views fall within Circulation of Transportation. These Scenic Views should be more clearly defined by some sort of identification in names as well. Some of those on the list need more protection under the Development and Planning Law as well as having protection under the Regulations. Where can we for example see the whole entire strip of 7 Mile Beach currently. In Low Density Residential Zone more attention must be paid to the zoning. Developers should not be allowed to build high raising buildings that distract from the Character of the neighbourhood which will phase out the attractiveness of local homes. This should be exclusive to apartments and townhouses. Persons have a right to light and air. It is time to remove the after fact applications. Once a breach has been committed there must be a penalty including imprisonment. We have lost too much mangroves and nothing was done about it. The question is how many of the wrong doers have been charged.</p>	<p>Section 5.7 of the Planning Statement (Natural Resources and Coastline) include the policy to 'Maintain panoramic views and vistas provided by the Islands' coastline'. This reference is not in page 24 (Circulation and Transportation).</p> <p>Each Area Plan will provide an opportunity to define building height restrictions for each zone in a manner that is appropriate to that locations.</p> <p>Provisions for After-the-fact planning approvals and penalties are set in Regulations, and outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p>	
	6-389		<p>Note that in the draft Planning Statement the intention is for this to be zoned Agricultural (page 12). This is more restrictive than the current zoning in that it removes: if the Authority is satisfied that any such land is not situated over a water lens and is not particularly suited to agriculture, it may permit any development which complies with the requirements for low density residential areas. How will existing landowners be compensated for CIG imposing these additional restrictions?</p>	<p>Noted. Consideration can be given to include reference to s.21 provision.</p>	<p>Authority to consider whether existing provision under s.21 of the Development and Planning Regulations should be referenced in the Planning Statement.</p>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR2	6-390		<p>The area is not the natural habitat for the blue iguana. Blue iguanas, bred in captivity have been released on the Salinas reserve, which we note is currently zoned as POS, starting in December 2004 due only to it being the land available. No blue iguanas existed on that land before then. The blue iguanas are not self-sustaining and are maintained by releases each year of further animals bred in captivity. Lately, the DOE/NCC have been doing everything possible to stop any development in this area on the basis that it is the blue iguana critical habitat. The traditional use of the land in this area for farming should be respected and there should not be any Overlay zone on the basis that this is a key habitat for the blue iguana. If the DOE/National Trust want to agree to a NRPO Overlay for the Reserves that is for them, but it should not be expanded beyond those Reserves and should not impact the adjoining and nearby properties. It should be incumbent on the DOE/National Trust to restrict the animals to the Reserves, by fencing or other means at their expense. Given the paucity of dry agricultural land in Cayman, the potential use of our properties as a key habitat for blue iguanas is not an efficient use of the land and given the fact that the blue iguana numbers are only maintained/increased by human interference through topping up the numbers by animals bred in captivity, is disproportionate to their value to Cayman verses the needs of a growing population and becoming self-sufficient for food. In short is runs contrary to the Vision and Strategic Objectives reflected in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the Statement as well as failing to balance the challenges outlined in section 2 of the Statement. Additionally note that the National Trust back in 2019 published its: Strategic-Species-Action-Plan-C.lewisi-2021-2026-FINAL-1.pdf (nationaltrust.org.ky). The objectives of this Plan, run contrary to the Vision and Strategic Objectives in the Statement.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of NRPO Overlays will be determined within each Area Plan, in consultation both with both Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private).</p>	
WR3	6-391		<p>General comments not related to specific sections. Legislation implementing Plan Cayman should be written in such a way that it is not easy for subsequent governments to reverse zoning plans and specific interpretations thereof. Of course, as time goes on later governments need to be able to do things truly necessary and for which a consensus exists. But it needs to be avoided that each time a political party or group that prefers certain sorts of development are in power, they can quickly change restrictions. In that scenario after a few political cycles the plan is useless, the island will be heavily developed and no longer a special place of value to the Caymans as a whole. Little Cayman is unique in that most of the residents and property owners are non-Caymanian, of various different sorts of status under Cayman Islands law. The Plan Cayman meeting talked about all residents having a voice. It must be ensured that the voices heard at such meeting and in submissions such as this are not ignored because in the case of Little Cayman many will not be from Caymanians. Ignoring the majority of voices from the island for that reason would result in a very partial and fragmented view.</p>	<p>Noted. Legislation drafting to support the Planning Statement is a later phase in the Plan Review.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process for PlanCayman all submitted representations are recorded and uploaded to the PlanCayman website with responses</p>	
WR4	6-392		<p>The Planning Statement does not discuss enactment or maintenance of the proposed zones, which raises important questions, for example: What will be done to prevent every new Cayman government from trying to change the Cayman Islands Development Plan?</p>	<p>The Planning Statement is being prepared in accordance with the Development and Planning Act. Legislation drafting to support the Planning Statement is a later phase in the Plan Review.</p>	
	6-393		<p>How can residents ensure that the plan is adhered to by policy makers and officials?</p>		
	6-394		<p>What recourse will residents have if the plan is mismanaged or changed by policy makers and officials?</p>		
	6-395		<p>Our main concern is your current policy for only accepting objections from residents within 1,000 ft of a planned development/commercial premises. The CI Government needs to appreciate that public amenity cannot be defined simply by proximity thresholds. Particularly when a development is commercial in nature, has a significant impact on the already declining areas of natural habitat remaining in these Islands, and results in a significant loss of public amenity (not just for those residing within 1,000 ft of the proposed development), the threshold for public objection to the proposed scheme needs to be significantly lower. There is already a significant amount of public scepticism that the CPA, and planning more broadly, operates with the necessary objectivity and independence; seeking to muzzle public opposition only serves to exacerbate those concerns. We draw your attention as residents of the Cayman Islands, to the words of the Law below.</p>	<p>Notification processes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p>	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR5	6-396		Sections 18 and 19 of the Cayman Islands Constitution Order 2009, which reads as follows: “Protection of the environment Section 18.- (1) Government shall, in all its decisions, have due regard to the need to foster and protect an environment that is not harmful to the health or well-being of present and future generations, while promoting justifiable economic and social development. (2) To this end government should adopt reasonable legislative and other measures to protect the heritage and wildlife and the land and sea biodiversity of the Cayman Islands that – (a) limit pollution and ecological degradation; (b) promote conservation and biodiversity; and (c) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources.”	Noted. It has been recommended to include a reference to the Cayman Islands Constitution within section 1.1 of the Planning Statement. Notification processes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	Amend section 1.1 as follows: "This Planning Statement is formulated under the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision), <u>informed by all relevant parts of the Constitution, including sections 15 and 18.</u> "
	6-397		“Lawful administrative action Section 19.-(1) All decisions and acts of public officials must be lawful, rational, proportionate and procedurally fair. (2) Every person whose interests have been adversely affected by such a decision or act has the right to request and be given written reasons for that decision or act. ” In consideration of the above, we suggest allowing greater weight to be given to opposition from land owners within 1000 ft of a planned development, but that instituting a mechanism to allow for opposition from ANY resident of the Islands would be a sensible step for the Government to take.		
WR6	6-398		Southside East Road Zoned SFR The great Cave area to be zoned NRPO along with the bluff edge to the road. An 1/2 mile narrow strip areas on the coastline to be open to public for tourist and residence to view the water etc Bluff. The lighthouse and at least 200 acres surrounding it has to be protected. Beach The beach at the old Divi Hotel to be acquired and made into a public Park. Lite Industrial area. Bluff road and Songbird area Heavy Industrial The port Area Economy Diving, Health, Nature, An Old Cayman House Area/Museum. Spott Bay. The long Beach to be protected	Noted, appreciate the suggestions. The zoning of individual parcels and more detailed policies will be consisted during the preparation of each Area Plan.	
WR7	6-399		It is with a great deal of dismay and frustration that I have witnessed numerous examples of indiscriminate clearing and other non-permitted activity on this island. It is my sincere belief that the importance of zoning and development regulations must also be coupled with a clear and indisputable method of enforcement. As one of the panelists accurately pointed out, the current climate makes it much easier to ask forgiveness rather than permission. The fines for infractions should be on a sliding scale in line with the severity of said infractions.	Noted. Section 5.3 indicates that land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission. If local requirements indicate that it would be preferable to the community that subdivision development is phased, this could be considered within each Area Plan. Provisions for enforcement will fall within the remit of the Compliance Unit within the Department of Planning.	
	6-400		Place limitations on the height of buildings proposed for placement at the bottom of the bluff and the distance from which they must be located from the bluff. These measures are imperative for the protection and endurance of endemic species.	Building heights and setbacks are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase.	
	6-401		Place strict height limitations on any buildings proposed for placement on the beach as well as set-back regulations taking into account climate change, erosion, and the potential for runoff and silting.	Building heights and coastal setbacks are not outlined in the Planning Statement but will be addressed at the Area Plan phase. The Planning Statement acknowledges the need to apply appropriate coastal setbacks based on shore conditions, offshore conditions and climatic considerations.	
	6-402		Institute a zero-tolerance policy regarding degradation of and impingement upon wetlands.	The Planning Statement recognises wetlands as an area of particular concern and introduces the NRPO (section 4.2) to provide a mechanism to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features with the underlying zone remaining in effect.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-403		Mount trashmore should stand as a cautionary tale of and an actual hideous monument to the dire necessity of instituting responsible waste management practices beginning with a ban on single-use plastics.	Section 5.5.3-4 of the Planning Statement refers to solid waste. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure compatible land uses are adjacent to and in the vicinity of existing landfill sites and any planned future solid waste management facilities.	
	6-404		Create incentives for the purchase of land to remain undeveloped and ecologically sustainable.	The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA.	
	6-405		Incentivize the placement of solar panels on homes and businesses by allowing for net-metering of excess/unused solar power. (This, of course, would be dependent upon the cooperation of the islands' power providers.)	Noted. The National Planning Framework acknowledged that incentives could be considered (such as revised regulations or simplified planning processes) to encourage renewable energy development, such as solar panels, wind turbines etc. These issues are therefore recognised and supported, but are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document.	
	6-406		Minimize existing light pollution and that which results from new commercial and residential development.	Noted. Section 5.5 is proposed to be amended regarding street lighting. Any more specific approaches to lighting in general that would be needed can be considered in each Area Plan.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> <u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u> <u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically</u> <u>and economically prudent to do so;</u> <u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>
	6-407		Finally, at the risk of belaboring points previously raised, enforcement is paramount as is the necessity for consequences befitting the infractions.	Provisions for enforcement will fall within the remit of the Compliance Unit within the Department of Planning.	
WR8	6-408		I would love for the Brac to look at Grand as an example of what NOT to do! I would hope that we would curtail the number of building permits to coincide with our Infrastructure. Especially focusing on our Dump to avoid another Mt. Trashmore and of course our very limited water supply. I know that many of our fellow Brac residents as well as residents on Little, would really appreciate it, if the Government in their "Planning Plans" would PLEASE put the Brac & Little as the first two districts to be sorted. Seeing that we do not have any plans in place at this time, and the Government rep at our meeting last week said they plan to do 2 districts a year!! If we are not dealt with first & second it will be too late for the sister islands by the time you get to us.	Each Area Plan will be prepared in full consultation with infrastructure providers, allowing for consideration of how each Area Plan fits within wider strategic infrastructure plans. The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
WR9	6-409		Bringing more cars into the Hurleys "Bottleneck" in the morning will only increase the congestion and frustration and backups, and in the evening the congestion backup caused by the Bottleneck for eastbound residents also will not change, only get worse with more cars coming in every week. The best solution is a causeway across the North Sound which will create a loop and much needed relief all day long. It will split (spread out) the congestion in two which is what's needed, not doubling it. There should be proper computer simulations comparing the new EWA and a Causeway, I am most sure the causeway will be the most efficient, and it will offer many benefits. It can connect the SMB Peninsula just North of the Landfill and a new Landfill can be created in an Eastern location and the trash trucks can use the causeway to efficiently move new materials so that mount Trashmore doesn't keep growing. Think about it, we are pulling millions of tons of Marl from the Quarries which are really lakes getting bigger and bigger, to cover the trash. Layer of trash then layer of marl, etc., etc.	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement notes that opportunities for development to contribute to improvements in the transportation system for all users, will be encouraged. The Planning Statement is flexible and drafted to accommodate public transportation plans and policies when brought forward by the NRA and Ministry of PAHITD.	
	6-410		Eventually we will all be living on Mount Trashmore because the quarry lakes kept getting bigger and bigger, and all that was left was mount trashmore. It's total madness, someone needs to take a serious look at the future, and do things now that are more efficient, instead of wasting millions of dollars closing of George Town and killing all the businesses there. Absolute madness. Spending money on things we don't need because they are seemingly fancy, and ignoring the real important things that need doing.	The Development Plan (the 'Plan') is intended to be a long-range comprehensive plan to guide physical development and the overall use of land in the Cayman Islands. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan.	
	6-411		We going to have to move the dump eventually anyway, how do you think the Garbage trucks will do in bumper to bumper traffic through grand harbor bottleneck. Create a Loop ! The environmental impact on the North sound is minimal, drill some holes and drop in the piles and the rest is all above ground(water). They can go right through the wetlands the same way, just piles, almost zero impact.		
	6-412		Do you know that we have around 150 cars per week coming into the island. One car in traffic takes up about 20 feet, so that's 3,000 feet per week of cars coming into the island, that's just over 1/2 mile of cars per week ! And no proper public transport system.	Vehicle importation is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
WR10	6-413		You have created a false duality: "...by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic, social and environmental outcomes while safeguarding the culture, health and general welfare of its people. " These two elements need not be in opposition. To consider them so is to prejudice your findings from the start.	Noted. The Planning Statement outlines the broad range of high level issues, challenges and opportunities facing the Cayman Islands, as well as defining Zones, Overlays and other Policy Considerations to approach them. More specific policies relating to the needs of different areas will be considered in subsequent phases of the Development Plan.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR11	6-414		The decision to have constant review is understandable but the concern is that it will still be several years before we have a comprehensive plan that covers the entire Cayman islands, which can have a negative impact on long-term development planning by the private sector, it is our recommendation that planned timelines are revised to accelerate the completion of the different Area Plans within a two- to three-year period to better guide long-term development planning.	Two Area Plans per year is an indicative timeframe, acknowledging that some Area Plans will be more complex than others. Resources can also be allocated to the process as necessary to ensure progress is maintained	
	6-415		There is no reference to how the Development Plan will interact with other national policies and laws. It was indicated that many of these policies were considered and influenced the drafting of the National Planning Framework. However, there appears to be a lack of guidance about how the CPA will be bound to honour the specific objectives of each of these policies when considering applications before that body.	The National Planning Framework and Planning Statement documents have been prepared with the intention of being consistent with approved Government policy. It is suggested to include a list of such policy documents as an appendix to the Planning Statement. Subsequent stages of the PlanCayman Development Plan review - Area Plans - which are intended to implement the national goals and policies of the Planning Statement in a way that is applicable to individual locations. As stated in section 3.1, the 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in the Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament’s approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. Also, section 5(3) of the Development and Planning Regulations states that where there is a conflict between Regulations and the Planning Statement, the Regulations shall prevail.	Consider adding list of approved National Policies as an appendix to the Planning Statement.
	6-416		It would be expected that a document as significant as the Cayman Islands Development Plan Planning Statement should have further detail on protecting/maintaining Seven Mile Beach as a national asset that would guide the drafting of the relevant Area Plan.	Noted. The purpose of the Planning Statement is to define the various Zones, Overlays and broad Policy Considerations which will be applied to each area during subsequent phases of the Development Plan Review. The importance of Seven Mile Beach as a national asset is recognised and policies required to address its protection / maintenance will be considered in full during the relevant Area Plan.	
WR12	6-417		Dear Sirs, Following are comments and areas of concern on the draft Planning Statement as presented. I served on the Plan Review Committee for North Side for the current 1997 Plan. I was honored to be asked to represent stakeholders and served along side various business owners, farmers and growers, residents, as well as then current Planning officers. Our group had several in depth meetings to review the 1997 plan as proposed. The vision for North Side that came out of those many meetings is I believe the same vision residents hope for today. I have made comments through the many years since when the “Go East” initiative was proposed making some of the same comments and sharing the same concerns that I have today. I understand that government may find itself at cross purposes with residents across all areas but will confine my comments to North Side and the Cayman Kai area in particular as it is what I represented in the 1997 plan currently in force.	Noted	
	6-418		The shown North Side/Rum Point area on current proposal wholesale includes Cayman Kai. As Planning and Lands and Survey are well aware, the Cayman Kai area was validated in a Grand Court decision as a scheme of development and registered deed restrictions previously recorded were codified in law. For the reasons that all stakeholders wished it to remain “The delightful community by the sea”. My family has fought to preserve and protect what we believe is one of the most beautiful spots in the world and we are deed restricted by law and subject to any owner within the Cayman Kai area enforcing those restrictions should they be broken. Only those specific parcels with existing business or existing condo development were exempt. Any attempt by government through Planning to bypass those restrictions would not be lawful in the eyes of the court per our decision. That court decision was notified to Planning on the day the decision came down in court. Much of what instigated that long and expensive endeavor came out of a planning decision to allow then developer ██████ to convert a restricted single family home to a business not allowed in our deed restrictions. As well, ██████ had charged me with forming an HOA to maintain roadways as he wished to exit his development role and turn over roadway maintenance to homeowners as the majority of his lots had been sold. The government had never done roadway maintenance within the Kai area.	Noted. Any Registered Deed Restrictions / Covenants remain in place and are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-419		The pressure on the Cayman Kai area via planning decisions since has not abated. The lack of specifics on the proposed plan for this area and North Side/ Rum Point in general is a concern. Obviously Government sees this area as the next Seven Mile Beach for development purposes. We have been aware of this direction and it contributed to our desire to preserve and protect an area both residents and tourists enjoy. Recent changes have received universal disappointment in both online travel forums and comments in local online papers. The entire charm and pristine rustic natural beauty that attracted us to Grand Cayman and North Side in particular in 1979 remains the vision many seem to share. I note the National Tourism Plan 2024 edition proves my point that governments vision may not be the the vision that made Cayman the tourism destination it is today absent very sensitive development respecting laws on the environment and property already in place. I hope the people of North Side shared some of these thoughts. I know there is a location within the Kai at the old Cayman Kai resort location that could house a sensitive and beautiful boutique hotel and areas outside of the Kai suitable to replace Driftwood which was much loved by all.	Noted. The relevant Area Plan will provide an opportunity to consider the appropriate vision and specific policies for the Cayman Kai / North Side area.	
	6-420		I am aware there is less money in developing on a smaller scale but many places in the world have made their mark doing just that. Please keep North Side the “getaway” from the development overtaking other parts of the Island. I believe these may be comments that resonate with those on Little Cayman and the Brac as well. Thank you for allowing me a chance for input and perhaps a different perspective. I remain available if needed to serve and sincerely hope that committee process is repeated in addition to presentations. I believe the committees formed for the 1997 plan prior to completion of that plan were critical to making sure it reflected each districts desires	Noted. The PlanCayman process will allow for continuous engagement and we welcome further involvement at the Area Plan stage.	
WR13	6-421		We have requested that Little Cayman's Area Plan should be prioritised, given that the Guidelines in Appendix 1 and 2 of the 1997 Development Plan date back to 1975 and 1977, and given some recent planning applications being considered by the DCB of the higher-density/container house type.	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-422		I am not sure if you have already pre-determined what format you would prefer the Area Plans to be in (for consistency), but the 1991 Development Plan Review attached will be a good place to start for the 2024 Little Cayman Area Plan Review. There was also an excellent study out of the University of Tennessee done in 1986 (with maps) which we can share in due course if that would help. We also believe the Vision 2001/2 exercise would be useful to read but have not been able to locate that (we have the North Side copy for reference). if you have a copy of the Little Cayman Vision planning document in the files at Planning we would be delighted if you could send it to us.	Noted, and we appreciate the supporting documents and references.	
WR14	6-423		On page 2 amend “(“CPA”)” to say (“CPA” or “Authority”) and amend (“DCB”)” to say (“DCB or the Board”)”	Acknowledged	Correct all references to 'Authority', 'Board', 'CPA', 'DCB' throughout the document
	6-424		Explanation: Inconsistent use of defined terms throughout the document. In particular, on page 2 the Central Planning Authority is defined as the “CPA” and the Development Control Board is defined as the “DCB”. However, later in the document they are referred to as the Authority and the Board, which terms are not defined.		
	6-425		The Planning Statement is well written and aspirational. We hope the politicians follow through with their approval when it is presented to Parliament, especially given how overdue it is. We welcome the Area Plans being added and we look forward to Little Cayman having its own so that we can Keep Little Special. We would like to request that Little Cayman and the Brac have their Area Plans prioritized given that they do not have any zoning at all and that a District Committee should be formed in Little Cayman to assist with drafting the Area Plan for Little Cayman (and a separate Committee for the Brac).	The determination of the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-426		We also suggest separating Little Cayman out at the Planning Board level as well, so that it has a Little Cayman Planning Board consisting of people who spend time on Little Cayman and who are knowledgeable of and invested in its present and future.	The membership of the DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. However, the request is noted and can be considered by relevant decision-makers	Recommend further discussion with Ministry / DCB / Cabinet
	6-427		Also, we suggest re-visiting the framework for notifications, which pits neighbour against neighbour, relies on a neighbour caring enough to bother to object, or having deep enough pockets to do so. There should be an additional category of objection allowed for Little Cayman by other stakeholders such as the LCDNT so that objections can be made for the wider benefit of all.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-428		We noticed there is no discussion of ‘grand-fathering’ of existing rights of landowners to develop. We note section 3(b) of Appendix 1 of the 1997 Development Plan (which applies to both the Brac and Little Cayman) specifically states that ‘Any person's existing rights of property must not be taken away through zoning or other regulations’, which is consistent with the earlier wording in section 3(a) regarding free enterprise being a priority. Landowners might object to planning zones if they perceive their rights of enjoyment and profit will be reduced. However, the LCPRG believes an Area Plan and the use of Zoning and Overlays to encourage careful development instead of overdevelopment will protect Little Cayman as a unique gem for generations to come.	Noted. All Area Plans will be prepared with full consultation with the community, government agencies / departments and stakeholders (public and private). This is in accordance with Development and Planning Act.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR15	6-429		The Planning Authority should formally recognize the NTCI as an independent body with a statutory duty to uphold the purposes of the National Trust Law for the benefit of the Cayman Islands' people. This would be done by enshrining a mechanism in the planning process by which no planning decision is made without proactive consultation by the Authority of the NTCI, and consideration of the views of the NTCI, if any. See background information in Ref# WR15	Cooperation with Government Departments (section 7 of the Development and Planning Act) is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The proposed 'Heritage Preservation Overlay' seeks to protect buildings and structures worthy of preservation. These will have to be determined with support from the National Trust for the Cayman Islands, other stakeholders and landowners at Area Plan stage.	
	6-430		Consider recommending that the NTCI have a duly appointed representative on the Central Planning Authority board to ensure that our statutory duties are considered in the planning process. At the very least, the NTCI should be consulted as an authority with whom the CPA must engage. See background information in Ref# WR15	The membership of the CPA and DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
WR16	6-431		Certain policies and guidelines were suggested as a means to meet NPF objectives, however they are not mentioned in the Planning Statement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Design Guidelines to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision Design Guidelines Site Design Guidelines Landscape Guidelines (Revise) Building Design Guidelines Sign Guidelines (Revise) Sustainable Construction Guidelines Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan Comprehensive Transportation Plan Airport/Industrial Transportation Plan Affordable Housing Policy 	Noted. The referenced guidelines documents remain as action items to be prepared as required. It should be noted that some of these would be led by other Government Departments / Agencies, and also that some elements could be considered at Area Plan stage to meet particular local requirements.	
	6-432		At what stage will these be drafted and who will be responsible to produce?		
	6-433		How will these be tied to the Development & Planning Regulations or Planning application reviews?	This is dependent on the nature of the document and whether it is incorporated within Area Plans (and subsequent Regulations) or as a stand-alone guidelines document that supports regulations.	
	6-434		Amend Page 4 to include an outline of which land use and overlay zones are new, being removed, modified, or replaced to give the general public a high-level understanding of the level of changes being proposed.	Noted. A reference can be added on page 4 to identify new zones	Include reference (asterisk or other) to identify new zones.
	6-435		Base recommendations to Area Plans and Regulations changes from data and formal studies conducted by local experts (govt. agencies). This work will create the foundation for policies and provide scientific justification for decisions. This will be helpful if there's pushback from the public for sensitive decisions.	Agreed. The preparation of Area Plans will consists of data gathering, engagement with technical experts and public consultation. Relevant experts within government departments, agencies and the private sector will have an opportunity to contribute to the process.	
	6-436		I recommend adopting a standardized introduction for each zoning category within Part Two – Planning Policy. This approach will ensure clarity and coherence, making it easier for the general public to understand the proposed policies. For instance, it is not clear what is proposed for Sections 3.9 & 5.2.	Noted, while section 5.2 is considered to be sufficient and includes policies relating to PADs, it is suggested that additional policy can be added to section 3.9.	Amend s.3.9 as follows" <u>"Coastal Mangrove Buffer (CMB)</u> <i>The Authority shall apply the Coastal Mangrove Buffer policies, and any other relevant policies of this Planning Statement, to ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development , except in exceptional circumstances . "</i>
	6-437		What will be the format of the Area Plan consultations? Charrettes, basic public meetings?	The CPA & DoP are in the process of exploring options to address the handling of Area Plan consultations. A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community.	
	6-438		After the Area Plans are ratified, suggest that for any application for a rezoning that a public meeting be held in the respective district, open to all district members. As the Area Plans will have had considerable input by the community, they should have input on proposed changes.	Suggestion noted.	
	6-439		Please include a summary of the submitted comments from the public meetings and consultations along with CPA/Ministry responses on the PlanCayman website at the end of the consultation period.	As part of the consultation process for PlanCayman all submitted representations are recorded and uploaded to the PlanCayman website with responses	
	6-440		The LCDCNT does not endorse the type, scale, and pace of development for Little Cayman that has occurred on Grand Cayman under the current 1997 Development Plan.	The CPA & DoP are undertaking this process in efforts to bring forward an updated Development Plan	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR17	6-441		The LCDCNT believes that Little Cayman requires a fundamentally different premise for development and any plan must recognise the special nature and circumstances of Little Cayman and the intrinsic value of its natural capital to the Cayman Islands and its people. Proposed Area Plans outlined in the Draft Statement could provide sufficient differentiation and codification for Little Cayman requirements. The LCDCNT seek assurances that the Area Plans concept will be robust enough to achieve a distinct, tailored plan for Little Cayman.	Noted. The PlanCayman process seeks to prepare a specific Area Plan for each of the Sister Islands in consultation with the community which will define priority for each of the islands.	
	6-442		The LCDCNT is of the view that the spirit of the guidelines for Little Cayman contained in the 1977 Plan and carried over to the 1997 Plan in Appendix 2 have not been followed by the Development Control Board and instead the 'free enterprise' of Appendix 1 has been their priority, particularly in relation to re- cent applications relating to high density container homes. We lament the fact that the DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW 1991, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE POLICIES AND ACTIONS FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN LITTLE CAYMAN by the Little Cayman District Advisory Committee was ignored in the development of later plans and has gathered dust since. These documents will serve as the basis for the LCDCNT's positions regarding a potential Area Plan for Little Cayman.	Noted. It is the intention that the preparation of a specific Area Plan for Little Cayman will provide more evidence and information to support decision-making in future. The 1991 document will be considered as part of the evidence base during initial Area Plan drafting.	
	6-443		The Draft Statement follows a planning philosophy that is completely reactive. This is set out in the Framework in the last paragraph of section 1.4. We believe this to be a fundamentally flawed starting point and that Little Cayman should have a maximum sustainable population or footfall at any one time in order to protect its biodiversity and ecosystem and the tranquil enjoyment of visitors and residents alike.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life. Measures to restrict footfall / visitors are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-444		Neither the Draft Statement nor the Framework provide any context for what healthy, desirable, and wise levels of population growth and development should be.		
	6-445		The Draft Statement provides no analysis or determination of what aspects of the existing 1997 Plan have been successful and which have not in order to inform the Statement now in process.	The objective of the Draft Planning Statement is to bring forward proposed zones and broad policies for a new development plan and not a performance analysis of previous plans. The consultation period for the Planning statement was opened to facilitate discussion on issues the public feel should be added or removed based previous plans and research.	
	6-446		The Draft Statement does not define or list any sort of quantifiable metrics, data, or parameters to measure whether it's Vision and Strategic Objectives are being achieved.	Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	
	6-447		Finally, we believe that the omission of defined beneficial levels of growth and development, supported by quantifiable metrics, is an abrogation of Planning's advisory responsibilities to government and its role to provide objective analysis of the state of growth and development of the country to the Caymanian people.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
WR18	6-448			No Comment	
	6-449		No more quarry. The noise and dust pollution caused by the quarry cannot be overstated. It affects the air we breathe, the quiet of the island, the coral reef, and it is currently breaking the law by disregarding setbacks yet faces no penalties or consequences. [NO] additional quarry being built on the bluff when the current one is breaking the law and nothing is being done about it.	Noted. The draft Planning Statement identified certain areas where aggregate extraction would not be permitted. More specific considerations for any future extraction activities may or may not be permissible in Cayman Brac can be considered as part of the Brac Area Plan.	
	6-450		Adoption of the Seabird Conservation Plan. [NO] cattle on the bluff instead of seabirds	Seabird Conservation Plan is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. Introducing Zoning in Cayman Brac through an Area Plan can start to determine locations that may or may not be appropriate for cattle.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR19	6-451		A building height limit in front of the bluff. Regardless of whether the SCP is adopted or not, the fact is that the bluff is critical habitat for our nesting tropicbirds. It is also Crown Land that deserves to be enjoyed by all. [NO] further disregard of our struggling and endangered native wildlife	Building heights will be considered within the Brac Area Plan.	
	6-452		Bury powerlines especially in front of the bluff. Many of our tropicbirds sustain injuries or death resulting from above-ground powerlines and their nesting habitats. They also fall down in storms and occasionally catch fire. [NO] increase in dangerous and unsightly powerlines	Noted. See suggested amendment regarding 'minimising the visual impact of electricity infrastructure.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> <u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u> <u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u> <u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>
	6-453		Meet UN Sustainability goal of protecting 30% of the island by 2030. See UN Sustainability Goal # 15.5. [NO] continuation of an unacceptably low 3% of this island being protected.	The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA. The National Trust for the Cayman Islands' Land Reserve Fund also contributes to this target of land protection.	
	6-454		A National Park on the Bluff with a park ranger. [NO] Development on the lighthouse edge of any kind other than for public recreation	Appropriate zoning will be considered during preparation of the Brac Area Plan in consultation with stakeholders (public and private).	
	6-455		Reinstate the Salt Pond as a wildlife sanctuary and other wetland protection.	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement. Appropriate locations for the Natural Resource Preservation Overlay will be considered during preparation of the Brac Area Plan.	
	6-456		[NO Brac] airport expansion that jeopardizes our wetlands	Noted, however the potential expansion of the airport in Cayman Brac is outside the remit of the Planning Statement. The CIAA is best suited to provide a response to the rationale of expanding the airport. Section 5.4.11 and 5.4.12 gives the Board the flexibility to support airports that are approved and not to determine if and where potential (not approved) airports are built/located.	
	6-457		Programs that facilitate solar panels on homes—see UN Sustainability Goal # 7 on ensuring access to modern energy. [No] Discouragement of solar panels for old guard oil profits	Building codes exist to ensure that future development is safe and resilient, and do not discourage solar panels. The Government's National Energy Policy Unit provides advice and energy saving guides for all properties. Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement supports the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources.	
	6-458		Dark Skies Initiatives to protect us against light pollution. [NO] loss of our dark skies which are endangered globally.	Noted. Section 5.5 is proposed to be amended. Any more specific approaches to street lighting in Little Cayman that would be needed to support this can be considered in the Area Plan. Turtle friendly lighting is typically required by Condition of Planning Approval in appropriate locations.	Amend section 5.5 as follows: <u>"Electricity and Street Lighting</u> <u>12. Support the long-term strategy to utilise alternative energy sources;</u> <u>13. Minimise the visual impact of electricity infrastructure, where strategically and economically prudent to do so;</u> <u>14. Minimise the impact of street lighting on the natural environment."</u>
	6-459		Mandatory turtle-friendly lighting. [NO] bright lights that disorient turtles, birds, affect neighbors and the coral reef		
	6-460		Golf carts for those of us who would like electric, low-impact vehicles	As stated in the Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement, "transportation - Support greater transportation choices that are sustainable for a growing population while being convenient, reliable, safe and accessible."	
	6-461		address our critically endangered rock iguanas being killed by traffic, much of it construction traffic	The Planning Statement supports the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. This will be achieved through encouraging walkability, promoting alternate forms of transportation and on street parking which can inadvertently result in motorists traveling at lower speeds.	
	6-462		Maximum speed limit reduction similar to Little Cayman		
	6-463		Proper waste management. [NO] more biohazard waste going untreated into our dump	Section 5.5.3-4 of the Planning Statement speaks to solid waste. The DEH is responsible for determining suitable locations and capacity of existing and future waste management facilities and drafting waste management policies which will be incorporated into the Development Plan.	
	6-464		Ban single-use plastic, including balloons. See UN Sustainability Goal # 12 on sustainable consumption for islands. This would help address our failed waste management infrastructure which is currently spilling into a protected wetland.	Noted. Section 5.5(3) can be amended to include recycling. A ban on single-use plastics is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	Amend s5.5(3), as follows: <u>"3. Support long-range plans for future solid waste disposal and recycling facilities";</u>

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-465		[NO] plastic in every establishment, including in the hospital when it is known to cause health issues	Outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-466		Create a program where land can be sold at a fair price to conservation	The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA. The National Trust for the Cayman Islands' Land Reserve Fund also contributes to this target of land protection.	
	6-467		[NO] Unnecessary forest fragmentation to serve a very small number of inaccessible plots and landowners unable to sell	Section 5.3 of the draft Planning Statement indicates that subdivision land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission for development on those parcels. In addition, section 5.3(3) notes that subdivisions should prevent the unnecessary fragmentation of large tracts of land.	
	6-468		Locate affordable housing near lower-earning jobs. Avoid increases in traffic resulting from affordable housing being built clear across the island from where the lower-earning jobs are located	The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions within communities along with mixed used developments and vibrant centres (work spaces). Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas.	
	6-469		Prohibit additional subdivisions until the currently approved ones are either sold or re-zoned	Section 5.3 of the draft Planning Statement indicates that subdivision land clearing should be reserved until the development of individual parcels is imminent through the granting of planning permission for development on those parcels. ⁴ Prohibiting additional subdivisions as suggested may have unintended consequences in terms of supply of lots, costs etc. It is however recognised that subdivisions should embrace the natural environment by retaining natural vegetation, key landscape features, and environmentally significant elements.	
	6-470		[NO] unmitigated overpopulation	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-471		Increase fines substantially for illegal clearing and create proper enforcement. [NO to] after-the-fact fines to be as meagre as they are currently	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-472		Require heavy machine operators to validate permit before heavy clearing begins. No one taking responsibility for the ongoing loss of forest habitat on this small island.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-473		Government should set an example by following their own rules. Government clearing land without permission because they thought they could like they did in 2023 on the bluff.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-474		Before diving into our response, by formal representation under Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act, we request the final revision of the Planning Statement undergo a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by an independent third party. This detailed screening would allow for the planning department to truly understand the long-term impact of their intended policies before implementation. This step would provide us with the opportunity to create truly lasting and sustainable development plans, and to get it right the first time. An SEA is a systematic process to ensure environmental and sustainability aspects are considered in policy, plan, and program making. It is a structured, participative, and transparent assessment, applied to plans, programs, and policies by public authorities and sometimes private bodies. SEA aims to support sustainable development and improve governance by providing a rigorous, evidence-based approach to decision-making	Noted. The Planning Statement is being prepared under the provisions of the Development and Planning Act and in consultation with all government departments / agencies and stakeholders (public and private).	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-475		By formal representation under Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act, a thorough, independent population analysis is crucial for sustainable growth planning in the Cayman Islands, allowing for strategic development decisions based on comprehensive data. Aligning the Planning Statement with an independent Carrying Capacity Report, considering various population scenarios, will ensure coordinated, sustainable development for the island. This comprehensive analysis will also enable the Cayman Islands Government and the electorate to make informed decisions on future development, preventing unnecessary costs and environmental degradation.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-476		By formal representation under Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act, to ensure alignment of existing law and policy, the protected areas under the relevant sections of the National Conservation Act , designated as the most important nature areas, should be included in the overarching area boundary zoning map to inform in decision making. These designations shall be specifically 'allocated' in Schedule 2 of the Development and Planning Act and should be referenced in the DPS policies to create a suitable framework for protection.	POS zoning could be applied to Crown-owned protected areas. This would provide greater clarity and understanding about the extent and location of these areas, for adjacent landowners and the community as a whole. The NRPO Overlay could also be applied.	
	6-477		Consider also the inclusion of an overlay showing Nominated Protected Areas – Awaiting Approval which are the nominations that have met the necessary criteria from the 2018 public consultation.	Protected Areas is a process administered by the DoE/NCC under the National Conservation Act. It is not considered appropriate to create an overlay under the Development Plan for nominated Protected Areas since it would require regular updating, a process that is an amendment of the Development Plan and requires approval in Parliament for each amendment.	
	6-478		Section 3.2 of the DPS, which concerns the proposed 'agricultural zone,' could inadvertently lead to increased development in unprotected natural areas, harming habitats and ecosystems. Currently, there is too much ambiguity relating to where zones will be located and exactly what type of development will be permitted in them.	The Area Plans process will determine appropriate locations for all zones and overlays.	
	6-479		Although the DPS acknowledges the need for balanced development and the protection of natural resources, detailed zoning maps and policies are lacking. They must clearly designate substantial areas for conservation to mitigate this concern. Introducing specific Green Space zones and stricter regulations on development in ecologically sensitive areas could help address this issue.	Detailed zoning maps and detailed policies will come in the next phase of the Development Plan process. The objective of the Planning Statement is to bring forward proposed zones and broad policies for a new development plan. The introduction of a 'Green Space Zone' is not considered appropriate at this time. The NRPO has been introduced as a mechanism to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features with the underlying zone remaining in effect. Protected Areas is a process administered by the DoE/NCC under the National Conservation Act.	
	6-480		Although section 3.8 states that "the Authority shall preserve land for public enjoyment, and protect them from non-recreational development," there is little mention of what land should be preserved, how it will be preserved, and what exactly is meant by 'non-recreational development.' This policy must be clarified before implementation.	The identification of zones and overlays will be consulted on in the next phase of the process. Also, non-recreational development as stated in Section 3.8.1 relates to activities/development that is neither active or passive open space recreation (as defined in section 3.8)	
	6-481		Clearly define and protect green space zones within the zoning maps to ensure that significant natural areas are preserved.	The introduction of a 'Green Space Zone' is not considered appropriate at this time. The NRPO has been introduced as a mechanism to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features with the underlying zone remaining in effect. Protected Areas is a process administered by the DoE/NCC under the National Conservation Act.	
	6-482		Introduce policies that mandate the inclusion of green spaces within new developments.	Various sections of the Planning Statement include references to the inclusion of open/green spaces within larger developments. This includes section 5.2 (PADs) and section 5.9.3 (which requires major developments to provide open space or active/passive recreation facilities, where appropriate).	
	6-483		Section 3.4, which relates to various commercial zones, fails to consider the push from developers to increase building heights, which may conflict with the character of the islands and the objective needs of the local population. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity on building footprint, something which developers could seek to exploit, reducing availability for public recreation space.	During the Area Plans phase of the Development Plan Process, consultation will be had in the respective indicative areas to determine a desired character which includes zoning & building heights.	
	6-484		The planning policies should include clear guidelines on building heights and footprints, especially in residential and tourism zones, to maintain the aesthetic and cultural integrity of the islands. A tiered approach to building heights that considers proximity to the coastline, landmarks & heritage sites, population density, and infrastructure capacity, while restrictions on building footprint size and mandatory public parks and green space within all new projects could help manage this issue effectively. Specifically, areas around the airport approach from the west and the adjacent south coast areas across the South Sound wetland basin, need to be properly evaluated following aircraft weather go arounds due to heavy rainstorms. Explicit policies mandating minimum green space percentages for residential, commercial, and mixed-use developments could ensure a healthier balance between built environments and natural areas. It should be noted that we are not advocating against density, only that large buildings must be considered within their wider context and benefit the population at large.	During the Area Plans phase of the Development Plan Process, consultation will be had in the respective indicative areas to determine a desired character which includes zoning, building heights, setbacks, density etc. Various sections of the Planning Statement include references to the inclusion of open/green spaces within larger developments. This includes section 5.2 (PADs) and section 5.9.3 (which requires major developments to provide open space or active/passive recreation facilities, where appropriate).	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-485		Enforce strict guidelines on building heights and development densities, especially in ecologically sensitive and coastal areas.	During the Area Plans phase of the Development Plan Process, consultation will be had in the respective indicative areas to determine a desired character which includes zoning, building heights, setbacks, density etc.	
	6-486		Require developers to allocate a minimum percentage of land to native green spaces and public amenities.	Various sections of the Planning Statement include references to the inclusion of open/green spaces within larger developments. This includes section 5.2 (PADs) and section 5.9.3 (which requires major developments to provide open space or active/passive recreation facilities, where appropriate).	
	6-487		Although the zones mentioned in section 3 are beneficial for defining development, they could also heavily restrict it. With land becoming increasingly scarce, focusing on zones that encourage the development of single-family homes could exacerbate the housing crisis already in effect in Cayman.	The Planning Statement sets out to provide a mix of housing solutions through zoning as seen in Section 3.3. SFR zones are proposed for periphery of urban areas and in locations where the infrastructure does not support increased density (i.e. additional units which generate traffic and wastewater issues). SFR zoning will only be applied to appropriate neighbourhoods, and these will be determined with the full input of residents and landowners during Area Plan consultation. There will be an opportunity within each Area Plan to determine appropriate densities, setbacks, height restrictions etc for each of the Residential zones.	
	6-488		Implementing a sustainable land management framework that includes land banking for future public use, stricter land use regulations, and incentives for sustainable development practices can help mitigate this concern.	Land purchasing / banking is outside the scope of the Planning Statement. The National Planning Framework acknowledged that incentives could be considered (such as revised regulations or simplified planning processes) to encourage renewable energy development, such as solar panels, wind turbines etc. These issues are therefore recognised and supported, but are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document.	
	6-489		The Planning Statement should also explore vertical growth options that do not compromise green spaces or the island's carrying capacity.	Building heights will be considered during the preparation of Area Plans in consultation with the community and stakeholders (private / public). Height setbacks, design solutions and density bonuses will be considered during this process.	
	6-490		Develop strategies to ensure affordable housing and access to essential services for all population segments.	The Planning Statement seeks to provide opportunities for safe and comfortable housing options for all income levels. Section 5.5 also acknowledges the need for sustainable physical infrastructure, such as wastewater, potable water, roads, electricity, gas, and telecommunication facilities, is essential to supporting a growing population and maintaining its quality of life standards.	
	6-491		No mention that the Planning Statement is a legally binding document	Once approved in Parliament, the Planning Statement will become Government Legislation. However, the draft Planning Statement notes in section 3.1 that the 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. Also, section 5(3) of the Development and Planning Regulations states that where there is a conflict between Regulations and the Planning Statement, the Regulations shall prevail.	
	6-492		At no point does the DPS mention that it is a legally binding document and the primary statutory development plan. Without mention of the primacy of the planning policies laid out in the Planning Statement, there is too much room for those who wish to work around the laws.		
	6-493		Set out in definitive language in the introduction of the Planning Statement that this is the primary planning framework of the Cayman Islands and the statutes laid out are binding.	Noted. Recommend text is added in section 1 to further clarify the legal status of the Planning Statement	Add text section 1 to clarify legal status of Planning Statement when approved
	6-494		The current plan does not adequately consider the healthy carrying capacity of the islands, which is crucial for long-term sustainability.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-495		The planning statement should include an expert independent assessment of the carrying capacity of the islands, considering factors such as population density, resource availability, and environmental impact. This assessment should inform zoning decisions, infrastructure development, and population management strategies to ensure sustainable growth.	All stages of the Development Plan review will be undertaken in full consultation with Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private).	
	6-496		As it stands, the DPS fails to go into detail of specific plans for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. Although the islands are often lumped together, the distinct and specific nature of these two islands is currently being disregarded, with the policies laid out in the DPS seemingly focusing on the more urbanized Grand Cayman.	As outlined in section 1.4, a key aspect of the structure of the Plan is the introduction of Area Plans, which provide	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR20	6-497		The planning statement must consider the unique nature of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. They are unique islands with specific needs that do not necessarily relate to Grand Cayman. Although there are certain policies that can be applied equally across the three islands, there are others that will be island specific. For example, policies that consider natural resources, coastlines, transport, and tourism will all be highly site specific.	a mechanism to implement national objectives and policies in a manner that is applicable to individual locations. Separate Area Plans are proposed for each of the Sister Islands.	
	6-498		Draft a planning statement for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman that considers the specific intricacies of life on those islands.	During the Area Plans phase of the Development Plan Process, consultation will be had in the respective indicative areas to determine a desired character which includes zoning & building heights.	
	6-499		The plan appears to prioritize economic growth, potentially overlooking the needs of the broader population, particularly those not in the high-net-worth segment. The DPS should emphasize inclusive growth by incorporating policies that ensure affordable housing, access to public services, and community facilities. Strategies to promote diverse economic opportunities beyond luxury tourism and finance sectors would benefit the wider population and create a more balanced development approach.	The Planning Statement supports balanced growth and the build out of vibrant and family oriented centres and living spaces. Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 5.5 and 5.9 of The Planning Statement support a mix of housing solutions, access to services, community facilities and open spaces through the suggested zones and policy considerations.	
	6-500		Diversify economic opportunities to reduce reliance on high-net-worth tourism and finance sectors.	Section 5.10(4) acknowledges the need to encourage economic diversification and new types of business activity;	
	6-501		There are little to no specific expressions of protections and safeguarding measures that will be given to ‘protected areas.’ without a definitive list of safeguarding measures, there is little reason to have protected zones. As the future primary source of regulation, the Planning Statement must include specific references to the rights given over to areas that obtain ‘protected’ status. The Planning Statement must provide a definitive list of protections afforded to zones designated as such. These could include: the right to place a moratorium on development; the right to restrict access in sensitive areas; the right to restrict development in overdeveloped areas.	The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA. The purpose of the NRPO is to recognise other natural resources / sensitive landscapes / ecosystems and to identify additional considerations that the Authority/Board will take into account in decision-making. It is anticipated that these NRPO properties will be identified in consultation with the DoE and the community during the preparation of Area Plans. Certain elements of the natural resource may be recommended for protection from development. Within Overlays the underlying zone remains in effect.	
	6-502		Currently there is no hierarchy of the policies laid out in the DPS. This is particularly concerning where plans conflict. Many of the policies laid out in section 5, particularly the Natural Resources Policy (5.7) could actively conflict with previous sections of the Planning Statement. Without a clear hierarchy of policy, these gaps can be exploited, leading to lengthy legal battles and long-term development issues. There must be a clear hierarchy of policy defined at the beginning of the Planning Statement. For example, the policies in Section 5 are overarching plans that should trump those reviewed in previous sections. There also must be a clear hierarchy within the sections themselves and where points within each individual section may conflict.	The Draft Planning Statement seeks to achieve a balance between different activities and make more efficient use of resources. The purpose of this is to promote more desirable and sustainable economic, social and environmental outcomes. If priorities can be established and agreed for different areas in the Cayman Islands, these can be articulated in each Area Plan.	
	6-503		The lack of focus on preserving the CMW in the current planning statement is particularly concerning, given its crucial role in local biodiversity, climate regulation, and supporting the economy through fisheries and agriculture. The CMW covers approximately 30% of the Grand Cayman’s land mass and is the largest intact area of mangrove wetlands in the Caribbean. This ecosystem provides essential services, such as carbon sequestration, rainfall regulation, and habitat for resident and migratory bird species, and supports local fisheries. The CMW has previously qualified as a Ramsar site, as well as an Important Bird Area (IBA) and meets the requirements to become a UNESCO World Heritage Site, underscoring its global ecological significance. Despite this, the draft 2024 Planning Statement does not mention the protection and conservation of this vital area. There are existing laws that allow land to be protected, and we would argue that a far larger part of the CMW should be protected. The CMW should be considered as critical infrastructure and a national asset for the island of Grand Cayman, such as the Brac Bluff is for Cayman Brac, to ensure its protection and sustainable management.	<p>The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA and is outside the scope of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>The Planning Statement does identify the CMW area as an indicative Area Plan boundary and so the detailed policies relating to this area will be determined during preparation of that Area Plan, in consultation with Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private).</p>	
	6-504		Specifically, Schedule 2 of the Development and Planning Act 2021 sets out matters for which provision may be made in development plans. At Part IV Amenities includes: 3. Allocation of land — (a) for communal parks; (b) for bird sanctuaries; (c) for the protection of marine life. 4. Preservation of buildings, reefs, sites and objects of artistic, architectural, archaeological or historical interest. 5. Preservation or protection of woods, trees, shrubs, plants and flowers Preservation of buildings, reefs, sites and objects of artistic, architectural, archaeological or historical interest. Preservation or protection of woods, trees, shrubs, plants and flowers	Noted. The proposed approach within the draft Planning Statement is to introduce a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (NRPO), section 4.2. The purpose of the NRPO is to provide a mechanism to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features with the underlying zone remaining in effect. Within Protected Areas and defined Critical Habitats (under the National Conservation Act) any development or activities should be in accordance with the relevant Protected Area Management Plan and/or Conservation Plan. In all other identified NRPO’s development which is consistent with the policies of this Plan and the Development and Planning Regulations will be permitted, although certain elements of the Natural Resource (such as those referenced in Part IV, schedule 2 of the Development and Planning Act) may be recommended for protection from development.	
	6-505		Designate the entire CMW as a protected area for land and wildlife under the National Conservation Law (NCL) as stipulated in sections 3 and 4, respectively.		
	6-506		Allocate the designated CMW as ‘Amenities’ under Sch.2 Part IV of the Development and Planning Act 2021.		
	6-507		Refer to this process specifically in section 3 of the Planning Statement, creating a new section called Protected Zones. This creates a structure which can be replicated to protect other ecologically important areas across the islands and fortified by an ironclad legal framework.	The protected areas process is administered by the DOE under the NCA. As noted above, the proposed approach within the draft Planning Statement is to introduce a Natural Resource Preservation Overlay (NRPO), section 4.2.	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-508		Implement strict development restrictions in and around the CMW to prevent habitat destruction	The NRPO will enable various mechanisms to ensure that development is sensitive to natural resources, as noted in section 4.2. Those relevant to the CMW will be determined during preparation of the relevant Area Plan.	
	6-509		Mandate comprehensive environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for any proposed projects that may affect the natural functioning of the wetland. It must also be stipulated that these assessments must be done by independent and unbiased third parties.	EIA processes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-510		Promote restoration initiatives to enhance the ecological health and resilience of the CMW.	Section 4.2(5) indicates that mitigation measures may be required, where necessary, to offset development impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures will be considered within each Area Plan.	
	6-511		Raise public awareness about the ecological and economic benefits of the CMW, emphasizing its role in climate regulation and supporting local fisheries.	Noted. Other Government Departments / Agencies and NGOs are better-placed to raise public awareness of the ecological and economic benefits of the CMW. It is noted however that these issues will be highlighted during the preparation of the relevant Area Plan and associated public engagement.	
	6-512		Engage local communities, stakeholders, and environmental groups in conservation efforts and decision-making processes.	Other Government Departments / Agencies and NGOs are better-placed to engage persons in conservation efforts.	
	6-513		Integrate policies that align with international environmental agreements, such as the Ramsar Convention, to ensure the CMW's protection aligns with global best practices.	The Cayman Islands is a Contracting Party to various Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). This is referenced in the National Planning Framework (NPF) which remains the overarching basis for all parts of the Development Plan review.	
	6-514		Enhanced Public Involvement: While the statement outlines comprehensive zoning policies, it should also emphasize continuous public engagement and transparency throughout the planning and implementation process. This will help address community concerns and ensure that development plans are aligned with public interests.	Section 11 of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Rev.) outlines the protocols by which Development Plans should be consulted on with the public. The CPA and DoP have decided to conduct consultation meetings within each district to further enhance public involvement. The structure of PlanCayman, where Area Plans are prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5-year plan review period, allows for a process of continuous review and community engagement. This enables the plan review process to be more responsive to changing pressures and the needs of the community and invites public involvement on a more regular basis	
	6-515		Carrying Capacity Studies: Include a mandate for regular carrying capacity assessments to inform zoning decisions. These studies should consider factors such as population density, resource availability, and environmental impact.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-516		Affordable Housing Initiatives: Develop and implement policies that promote affordable housing options for all segments of the population. This will help ensure that the benefits of development are equitably distributed. New homes could be funded through the profits of specific taxes, such as those levied on hotel rooms, so that as the tourism industry grows, so do the funds available for subsidised housing.	The Planning Statement sets out to achieve a mix of housing solutions within communities along with mixed used developments and vibrant centres (work spaces). Ultimately, the residents will determine the character of the respective indicative areas. The Planning Statement, the DoP, CPA and DCB are not responsible for conducting affordable housing needs studies but to create a Development Plan that will support these policies when they are brought forward. Kindly note, The Ministry of Planning, Agriculture, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport and Development (PAHITD) launched a comprehensive survey aimed at gathering valuable insights to inform the development of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan.	
	6-517		Sustainable Development Incentives: Provide incentives for developers to adopt sustainable practices, such as green building certifications, energy-efficient designs, and the use of renewable energy sources. An example of this was the Green Homes Grant in the UK which provided homeowners and landlords with up to £10,000 to make upgrades to their homes that would make them more sustainable.	Noted. The National Planning Framework acknowledged that incentives could be considered (such as revised regulations or simplified planning processes) to encourage renewable energy development, such as solar panels, wind turbines etc. These issues are therefore recognised and supported, but are outside the scope of the Planning Statement document.	
	6-518		Sustainable Design Standards: Adopting aspects of international certifications such as BREEAM, WELL, LEED, and Passivhaus into our standard building codes would force developers to build more environmentally consciously. Furthermore, specific standards relating to Cayman and our needs could be developed out of these international standards	Building Codes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement. Section 5.6 (4) of the draft Planning Statement encourages building design to take full advantage of passive solar energy and natural ventilation and section 5.6(7) encourages resilient design as a protective measure against climate change and demand on infrastructure and utilities.	
	6-519		Review and revise the 2024 Draft Planning Statement to ensure alignment with these policies and legal instruments: National Energy Policy, Climate Change Policy, National Conservation Act, National Development Plan, Cayman Biodiversity Strategy and Blue Iguana Recovery Plan, Ramsar Convention, Convention on Biological Diversity and Paris Agreement. <u>See background information in Ref# WR20</u>	The draft Planning Statement has been prepared with reference to approved Government Policy. It is recommended that a list of such policies and legal instruments can be added in an appendix to the Planning Statement.	Consider adding list of approved National Policies as an appendix to the Planning Statement.
	6-520		Include cross-references to relevant policies and laws throughout the document to highlight their importance and guide implementation.		

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-521		Establish a monitoring and evaluation framework to track progress and ensure compliance with the integrated policies and legal instruments.	The role of the Planning Statement is to define Zones, Overlays and broad Policy Considerations. It does not set targets or measurable objectives. Section 1.6 'Strategic Objectives' is proposed to be amended to 'Strategic Goals' for this reason. However, each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identifies progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	
	6-522		Encourage urban and rural planning practices that support biodiversity	Various sections of the Planning Statement include references to biodiversity, which forms part of the balance between competing demands for the use of land.	
	6-523		While it's not mandatory to explicitly mention climate change in the statement, given its significant impact on the Cayman Islands and many other regions, it is advisable to include it. Incorporating climate change into the vision statement demonstrates a forward-looking approach and a commitment to addressing one of the most pressing challenges of our time.	<p>Section 2.7 of the draft Planning Statement outlines the impacts that Climate Change will have on the Islands. Some additions and amendments are proposed to this section. In terms of mitigation measures, the draft Planning Statement outlines numerous resiliency measures and greater detail is anticipated in each Area Plan to reflect the climate change impacts anticipated in those places.</p> <p>MSCR is a part of the project team for the Planning Statement and will be engaged on an ongoing basis as the Plan Review progresses.</p>	Amend s.2.7, as follows: <i>"A number of significant changes in climate change-impacts are affecting the Cayman Islands, including changes in storms, cyclones, winds, waves and storm surges; changes in ocean circulation; changes in rainfall patterns and changes in freshwater input; ocean acidification; changes in salinity; accelerated sea-level rise; increasing air and sea temperature s (including humidity); increasing coastal erosion; and decreasing dissolved oxygen of seawater. These create a host of impacts, including but not limited to heatwaves, droughts and floods; increased coastal erosion; reduced agricultural productivity; and increased diseases which jeopardise lives, livelihoods and property. These impacts and the resulting risks to the Cayman Islands economy, society, biodiversity and habitats are detailed in the Cayman Islands Climate Change Risk Assessment which is updated every five years. "</i>
	6-524		The National Planning Framework for Scotland is a recent example of a comprehensive and urgent approach to addressing the climate emergency and biodiversity crisis, emphasizing the need for resilient, restorative communities in line with globally accepted standards. It sets out a clear vision for net-zero, nature-positive places designed to reduce emissions and adapt to climate change impacts while protecting and restoring the environment.	Noted	
	6-525		The vision should reflect the long-term goal of creating a balanced, prosperous, and environmentally responsible community. With that in mind, the vision statement could read as the following: "Enrich the quality of life in the Cayman Islands through holistic development that harmonizes economic prosperity, social well-being, and environmental stewardship, while cherishing the cultural heritage, safeguarding health, and nurturing the general welfare of its people, in resilient response to the impacts of climate change" .	Noted. Some amendments are proposed to the vision (section 1.5).	Amend 'general vision' (section 1.5), as follows: <i>"Maintain and enhance quality of life in the Cayman Islands by ensuring that development promotes the most desirable balance of economic-social and-environmental and economic outcomes, while safeguarding Caymanian Heritage, the culture; and the health and general welfare of its people."</i>
	6-526		The Cayman Islands' planning statement should evoke a sense of urgency and commitment to addressing climate change and biodiversity loss.	<p>Section 2.7 of the draft Planning Statement outlines the impacts that Climate Change will have on the Islands. One of the Strategic Objectives of the draft Planning Statement is 'Climate Resilience: Incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies'. Policies relating to Climate Change are incorporated throughout the draft Planning Statement, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Section 3.8: Open Space Zones: Preserve land for public enjoyment and protect them from non-recreational development- Section 3.9: Coastal Mangrove Buffer: Ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development- Section 4.2: Natural Resource Preservation Overlay: Ensure development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features- Section 4.6: Sensitive Coastline Overlay - control development of highly vulnerable coastal areas and incorporate appropriate building, site and landscape design- Section 5.4: Circulation and Transportation: Support existing and future public transport operations and encourage conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel.- Section 5.6: Design Encourage resilient design as a protective measure against climate change, storm surge and sever weather events- Section 5.7: Natural Resources and Coastline: Minimise the impact of major development on the natural environment, ensure developments in coastal areas incorporate hazard risk reduction mechanisms	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-527		Highlight the specific vulnerabilities of the Cayman Islands to climate change impacts, such as sea-level rise, extreme weather events, and coastal erosion.	These are outlined in section 2.7 of the draft Planning Statement.	Amend s.2.7, as follows: "A number of significant <i>changes in</i> climate <i>change-impacts</i> are affecting the Cayman Islands, including changes in storms, cyclones, winds, waves and storm surges; changes in ocean circulation; <i>changes in rainfall patterns and changes-in</i> freshwater input; ocean acidification; changes in salinity; <i>accelerated</i> sea-level rise; increasing air and sea temperature <i>s</i> (including humidity); <i>increasing coastal erosion</i> ; and decreasing dissolved oxygen of seawater. <i>These create a host of impacts, including but not limited to heatwaves, droughts and floods; increased coastal erosion; reduced agricultural productivity; and increased diseases which jeopardise lives, livelihoods and property.</i> These impacts and the resulting risks to the Cayman Islands economy, society, biodiversity and habitats are detailed in the Cayman Islands Climate Change Risk Assessment which is updated every five years. "
	6-528		The introduction should be expanded to highlight the unique challenges and opportunities faced by British Overseas Territories (BOTs) in terms of urban development and environmental conservation. For example, you can discuss how BOTs often grapple with limited land resources and vulnerability to climate change impacts due to their geographical locations.	These issues are reflected in section 2 of the draft Planning Statement.	
	6-529		Emphasize the importance of sustainable development in enhancing resilience to climate change and other environmental threats while ensuring economic prosperity and social well-being for residents. Provide examples of how other OTs have successfully implemented sustainable development initiatives.	The objective of the Draft Planning Statement is to define Zones, Overlays and other broad Policy Considerations. Examples of sustainable development initiatives are not considered suitable for this type of document.	
	6-530		Explicitly state the relevance of the planning statement in addressing challenges faced by BOTs due to urbanization and environmental vulnerabilities.	Section 2 of the draft Planning Statement outlines the Challenges and Opportunities faced in the Cayman Islands.	
	6-531		Strengthen the policy statements to reflect a stronger commitment to sustainability and resilience. Include specific references to climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and inclusive growth.	The role of the Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and to articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. The wording in the draft Planning Statement is considered to be appropriate to achieve this.	
	6-532		Community Engagement Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Foster continuous community engagement throughout the planning and implementation process.• Establish mechanisms for regular public consultations, feedback sessions, and participatory planning workshops to ensure that community voices are heard and considered.	As stated in section 1.2 of the Planning Statement, the structure of PlanCayman, where Area Plans are prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5-year plan review period, allows for a process of continuous review and community engagement. This enables the plan review process to be more responsive to changing pressures and the needs of the community and invites public involvement on a more regular basis. The intention is that this will make the plan review more accountable to the community and provide greater clarity about how individuals can contribute to the process and have more of a say in the future of their neighbourhood	
	6-533		Monitoring and Evaluation Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop a robust monitoring and evaluation framework to track the implementation of the planning statement and assess its impact.• Include specific indicators and targets for sustainability, resilience, and inclusivity to guide and measure progress.	Each Area Plan will include an implementation framework that identify progress / success indicators, monitoring etc	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-534	Other	<p>We, the undersigned, hereby submit this report of representations on the above captioned to the Central Planning Authority (CPA) and ask that it:</p> <p>1. Extend the public consultation period until 30th September 2024, for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. It has been 27 years since the last review and while we concur that The Development Plan 1997 ("the Plan") requires amendments, we prefer that it is done <u>right</u> rather than just <u>symbolic amendments</u> to it. Recognizing that the Planning Statement is an important pillar in the ongoing "Plan Cayman" process, our Feedback Committee feels strongly that the language in that Statement must be clear and specific if it will be effective in informing and a driver to other phases of this important project.</p> <p>b. It is apparent that many people have not read the Plan Statement, and an additional sixty (60) days will give:</p> <p>i. The Authority additional time to conduct more public consultation and outreach activities.</p> <p>ii. The Public a total of four (4) months to review the Planning Statement, which is generally 4 times what is afforded for other legislative changes and negate any complaints that the process is being rushed.</p> <p>c. Having the month of July as half of the consultation period is not conducive to those parents who planned to vacation with their children during this month.</p> <p>d. If the current process is to be continued start with the Area Plans, Regulations and the Planning Act. These are what the public see and feel, and</p>	<p>At its meeting of 14 August 2024 (CPA/21/24; item 3.1) the Authority was advised that representation was received from the West Bay Feedback Committee requesting the public consultation period be extended until September 30, 2024. The Authority considered the request and determined it could not be granted as to do so would be contrary to the provisions of Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision).</p> <p>The Planning Statement consultation process involved significant public outreach, as detailed in the 'Consultation Report' prepared by the Department of Planning. The two month consultation period included 7 Public meetings, 1 'Virtual Town Hall' event, radio appearances, newspaper notices and advertisements, social media postings and direct email communication to mailing list subscribers.</p>	None
	6-535		<p>e. Confirm that the current process is legally defensive vis-a-vis s10. (1) Part II, The Development and Planning Act 2021, which states that</p> <p>"At least once in every five years after the date on which a development plan for any area is approved by the Cayman Islands Parliament the Authority shall carry out a fresh survey of that area, and submit to the Cayman Islands Parliament a report of the survey, together with proposals for any alterations or additions to the plan that appear to them to be required having regard thereto."</p> <p>Our position is that the current process is ultra vires as the report of the survey and other pertinent documents will not be submitted to Parliament within one (1) year in accordance with s10. (1). Furthermore, as the current process is expected to take more than five (5) years to complete the result is that it will be time for another five (5) year fresh survey before this one is even completed.</p> <p>Below are additional reasons to support why the Authority should extend the public consultation process.</p>	<p>Section 1.2 of the Draft Planning Statement explains the proposed review cycle of PlanCayman and that since Area Plans are intended to be prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5 year plan review period, it provides for a process of continuous review and community engagement.</p>	None
	6-536		<p><u>2. Rationale for the Committee's request for more time</u></p> <p>To elaborate on the overriding request made above and further elaborated on below, the Committee wishes to convey these supplementary observations.</p> <p>We commend the Government and the CPA for embarking on this project, after several years of delay in the latest effort to review The Plan. We are however concerned, arising from the first Public Consultation Meeting held by the Plan Cayman project team on 4th June in West Bay, that insufficient time is being given to the public to fully understand, question, discuss, and provide input on the Plan. From the outset we also detected what appeared to be a deficiency in the resources dedicated by the Government (through the respective Ministry) to the project.</p> <p>To date we have not been able to see any evidence of a Project Manager or Office for this important project; it appears that a small number of technocrats are multi-tasking on this, along with their other workload. Additionally, the process seems too vague and low-key to really be taken seriously. For example, we have not seen evidence of: - a Project Plan, Milestones, or Deliverables. Additionally, what are the measures that will be used to determine the success or effectiveness of the important long-term effort?</p>	<p>Resources will be allocated to the PlanCayman process as necessary to achieve delivery of the various stages and documents.</p> <p>Each Area Plan will include an implementation schedule and Key Performance Indicators to monitor its effectiveness</p>	None
	6-537		<p>In all the Public Consultation meetings held on the Plan Cayman's Planning Statement to date, there is a trend in the key issues that emerged. These are: what is the Population projections and "carrying capacity" that would be adopted for the Islands; how does this Plan coincide with other review plans that are ongoing, such as the recently commenced Cargo Port review and the Cruise Port referendum; the EW Arterial corridor; redevelopment of the three airports; and how legal, realistic and practical is the timeline for the project. Recently it was announced by the Government that after seven (7) years of work and discussing the Landfill "ReGen" project, the project is being abandoned. Members of our Committee were concerned about this outcome, as it does not auger well for the successful completion of a bigger and broader "Plan Cayman" project which has a more robust and dynamic set of deliverables.</p>	<p>The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.</p>	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR21	6-538		<p>3. Is the proposed project plan and timeline sustainable and beneficial?</p> <p>It has been stated by the CPA's project team that Plan Cayman will be broken into 11 District Areas Plans. Once the Planning Statement is agreed upon, the next step would be to draw up these Area Plans, and these would also undergo public consultation. It has been proposed by the Plan Cayman project team that two (2) Area Plans per year would be done, which is estimated to take 5 ½ years to complete the 11 Area Plans. It is not clear how realistic this timeline is, what steps are involved within the project Timeline, what sensitivities exist within the Critical Path of the project, and whether staff and other resources would be made available to the Project Team until the Plan Cayman segment of the project is successfully completed.</p> <p>As we know, at the same time as this Plan Cayman project would be ongoing, the regular work of the CPA, the Planning Department and other connected stakeholders would be continuing unabated, and with the existing rules, in considering a plethora of plans and projects within the Islands. There is therefore a risk that if the existing system and level of activity continues, without a "cooling off period" such as a moratorium on certain types of development projects, the Plan Cayman Planning Statement and Area Maps could be obsolete before the Planning officials receive final approval and the legislative authority to implement and enforce the new Plan.</p>	<p>The National Development Plan Project Delivery Plan (available on www.plancayman.ky) identifies high-level risks and mitigation measures, along with budget considerations.</p> <p>A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life.</p>	None
	6-539		<p>4. Further comments to support our request for an extension of time and a new approach:</p> <p>In view of the foregoing, in addition to requesting an extension of time for the Planning Statement as referenced in 1. a., b, c, d, and e, above, the Committee makes the following recommendations and requests, which we feel are important to assure the success of a proper long-term development vision and plan for the Cayman Islands.</p>	Noted	None
	6-540		<p>5. Why is an extension of time to review the Planning Statement needed:</p> <p>An extension of time as we have requested will allow the project team to collate other national plans or reports that have been developed and published in the past several years and consider whether these documents are instructive to this Plan Cayman project. The NPF stated that prior plans and reports have been reviewed, but it is not clear whether any of the previous recommendations are incorporated in the project plan and timeline for the existing Planning Statement and Areas Plans development exercise.</p> <p>A second benefit of a time extension is to enable decision-makers to assess whether the proposed workplan and timeline (5 ½ years) is practical, legal and prudent.</p>	Noted. The continuous review cycle of PlanCayman enables the plan review process to be more responsive to changing pressures and needs. Other national plans or reports can be reviewed and reflected in the Development Plan review at appropriate stages.	None
	6-541		<p>6. Is an overall "pause" and re-focusing of the Plan Cayman exercise needed?</p> <p>We feel that at the same time as proposing an extension of time or a "pause" in the PlanCayman project, there MUST also be a moratorium or "breathing space" in the economy, to prevent any gains made in the Development Plan process to be overtaken or exacerbated by simultaneously continuing the approvals of new large developments which will have material impacts on the same factors. This is crucial to managing the "carrying capacity" of the various developmental impacts for the Islands.</p> <p>Therefore, we propose the following concurrent actions at this time, to mitigate further irreversible impacts prior to a Plan being agreed:</p> <p>6.a. A moratorium on the approval by the CPA of large 10-story buildings, primarily in the coastal zones, UNTIL a new Plan is approved for the Islands.</p> <p>6.b. A moratorium by the CPA on further residential or resort/commercial redevelopments on the 7 Mile Beach area, UNTIL new coastal Setback limits and rules are included in the Regulations.</p> <p>6.c. A moratorium on the reclamation or Filling of large tracks of wetlands, UNTIL stormwater and drainage plans are designed, approved, and ready for implementation for specified zones within the Islands.</p> <p>6.d. No additional removal of the coastline mangrove buffer.</p>	Noted, however a moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life	None
	6-542		<p>7. Is a different approach needed in order for Plan Cayman to become a reality?</p> <p>The WB Feedback Committee is concerned that the present Plan Cayman exercise is totally and woefully under-resourced, and as a result its success is haunted by an unworkable project plan, a timeline which is not prudent (possibly ultra vires), and deliverables which are not measurable or sustainable.</p> <p>We feel that a different approach is needed in order to complete the ENTIRE Development Plan ("Plan Cayman") in a more prudent timeline of 1-2 years, instead of the proposed 5 ½ years. This will require a much more robust approach, increased resources and an expanded full-time project team. Rather than attempting this large body of work by an internal part-time and multi-tasking technocrats in the Planning Department, it may be necessary to consider a public-private partnership with some sort of consortium. This will provide this project with the deep technical knowledge that it deserves, and with a new project plan and team that will be held accountable to enhanced and measurable milestones and deliverables. This is crucial to ensure that current development activities do not overtake the assumptions and recommendations that would come out of the Plan review exercise.</p>	The Department of Planning has operational budget for this project. If necessary, a business case can be developed for funds to expedite the creation of Area Plans in Phase 3 of this project.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-543		<p>8. Concluding comments:</p> <p>Throughout this short public consultation and feedback the West Bay Feedback Committee has observed quite a bit of concern from attendees to our meetings, as well as from commentators at other District meetings as well as in the media and Radio talk shows and interviews. Key among these were: the call for increased consultation time in order for people to better understand the issues, the process and the alternatives; concern about the lack of policy or forecasting on the population impacts of various decisions; and an overall feeling of ambivalence and disillusionment with the future of Cayman and the apathetic attitude of the political directorate to invest robust intellectual capital and resources to come up with a new Development Plan for the Cayman Islands. The Committee is concerned that this existing process must not fail, and sadly result in another aborted attempt to create a new Development Plan for the Islands.</p> <p>This is why we are suggesting a total rethink of the project plan and approach/steps, because we feel that the current trajectory is heading for a disaster. We are not proposing a derailment of the exercise, we are suggesting a more workable and achievable Plan Cayman process. The younger generations are becoming engaged in this process, but they need to be given a fair chance to participate in, understand, and to express their views of where these Islands should be in the next 50 years. We have carefully noted the concerns of young people who have attended our meetings and have spoken out publicly in other settings during this short consultation period; we are advocating on their behalf as well.</p>	<p>At its meeting of 14 August 2024 (CPA/21/24; item 3.1) the Authority was advised that representation was received from the West Bay Feedback Committee requesting the public consultation period be extended until September 30, 2024. The Authority considered the request and determined it could not be granted as to do so would be contrary to the provisions of Section 11(3)(a) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision).</p> <p>The Planning Statement consultation process involved significant public outreach, as detailed in the 'Consultation Report' prepared by the Department of Planning. The two month consultation period included 7 Public meetings, 1 'Virtual Town Hall' event, radio appearances, newspaper notices and advertisements, social media postings and direct email communication to mailing list subscribers.</p> <p>The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.</p>	None
	6-544		<p>As can be seen in the accompanying representations on the Planning Statement, the Committee has provided input on how certain areas of the document can be improved, and areas where we support. We nevertheless feel very strongly that the process is weak, and therefore request that this cover letter forms an integral part of our submission on the aforementioned document. We therefore urge the CPA to accept the above additional reasons for an extension of time and/or a complete rethink of the review process, deliverables, timeline and funding.</p>	<p>In terms of engagement of younger persons, this is noted and opportunities to further engage with all members of society will be taken in future phases of the Development Plan review.</p>	None
	6-545		<p>We would first like to acknowledge that the preparation and approval of the Development Plan is very politically challenging and difficult. The National Planning Framework which was consulted on some six years ago attempted to introduce some actionable policies to advance proper planning for the country. There does not appear to be a tight, transparent relationship between that document and the published Planning Statement. Furthermore, six years cannot be considered a reasonable timeframe within which to advance to the next step of a formal planning process without also formally revisiting the data, statistics and assumptions which underpin the strategic level document. Unlike the 2003 Development Plan Review which established and took detailed input from various "issues committees" comprising public and private sector experts and the general public, it is not clear where the strategic direction of the published Planning Statement has come from.</p>	<p>The National Planning Framework (NPF) includes a combinations of policies and action items and the policies within the NPF have been incorporated into the draft Planning Statement. The NPF also made reference to many Government studies and plans, along with Issues Committees work from previous Development Plan reviews.</p> <p>Any data and statistics within the Planning Statement use updated figures.</p> <p>The Planning Statement is one stage in the PlanCayman process. Stakeholders and the general public will have further opportunity to input into the Area Plan stage</p>	None
	6-546		<p>Nevertheless, given that this is the first time in over 20 years that the 1997 Development Plan is being reviewed the Department of Environment and the National Conservation Council submit that every effort must be made to ensure that the updated plan provides:</p> <p>(i) evidence-based policies and processes that support development that properly takes into account the environment, society and the economy of the three Cayman Islands, and</p> <p>(ii) robust legislative and administrative processes that are based on the best available planning practice guidance and which allow the country to better manage, direct and enforce all aspects of physical development.</p> <p>The comments and recommendations which follow are provided with these goals in mind.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-547		<p>1. The Evidence Base to Support the Planning Statement is Absent</p> <p>We would have expected to see an evidence base to support and underpin the Planning Statement so that it can be based on sound logic, realistic projections, reasonable assumptions and objective evaluations. We have found the Jersey Island Development Plan to be a useful reference point for what our development plan process could and should look like. This Island Plan started with a stage called "scoping, Research and Options" and included stages called:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- scope and develop the evidence base requirements,- commission reports and studies,- explore initial strategic strategies and options, and- develop Sustainability Appraisal - the set of principles which will ensure that a balance is maintained between environmental, social and economic priorities. <p>For the Jersey Island Plan, this Scoping, Research and Option stage was done even before a draft Island Plan was developed. The Cayman plan has not been developed based on any evidence and an objective review of the needs of the country. Therefore, it is not clear to us how the Cayman Development Plan can meet the needs and wants of the people of the Cayman Islands without any objective assessment or public consultation of what those needs and wants are.</p> <p>For example, we and the general public recognize that there are severe housing challenges for residents of Cayman. There are similar challenges for Jersey, but their Island Plan has started with an objective assessment of housing needs, started by answering the question of "who are we building for", a question that echoes throughout much of the public discourse on the subject in Cayman. The Jersey plan then goes on to include spatial strategy options such as "increased density within the town", "outward expansion of the town to the south", "development of a new town". These options are reviewed, with opportunities and challenges for each presented and then the stage presents questions at the end for people to provide their opinion (refer to Figures 1 to 3).</p>	<p>Noted and thank you for the suggestions, however, the context for Development Plan review is significantly different in Jersey. Jersey operates under a 'Discretionary planning system (as is typical in the UK), whereas Cayman is based on primarily a Zoning system with some elements of discretion.</p> <p>The purpose of the Planning Statement therefore is to define the various Zones, Overlays and Other Policy Considerations that will be applied to different Areas in Cayman in subsequent stages in the Development Plan review. The broad spatial strategy options suggested can be incorporated as necessary at Area Plan stage in Cayman where the community will be invited to suggest ways in which their neighbourhood may grow or adapt in future.</p> <p>The preparation of Area Plans will consists of data gathering, engagement with technical experts and public consultation. Relevant experts within government departments, agencies and the private sector will have an opportunity to contribute to the process.</p>	None
	6-548		Taking appropriate, affordable housing and associated traffic impacts as one of the main concerns for Cayman's population, the Planning Statement should have been developed with first assessing what we have and what we need.	Noted. Many data gaps are outside of the CPA / Department of Planning remit and are being undertaken by other government Ministries, Departments and Agencies. The role of PlanCayman is to incorporate this information as it comes forward.	None
	6-549		<p>We have reviewed the 2018 draft Strategic Plan and have noted action items such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Carry out capacity modeling exercise to determine potential growth within Planning Areas,- Conduct an inventory of prime agricultural land and its current status, and- Create a forecast for long-term residential demand and associated impacts on land use, building form and tenure options. <p>It appears that the current Planning Statement has been put forward without any movement towards those very worthwhile action items, which would aid in developing an evidence base for the Planning Statement.</p>	Noted. Many data gaps are outside of the CPA / Department of Planning remit and are being undertaken by other government Ministries, Departments and Agencies. The role of PlanCayman is to incorporate this information as it comes forward.	None
	6-550		To support this development plan review, we could easily have prepared updated environmental statistics on, for example, man-modified areas that do not contain structures and therefore may be suitable for development or the number of subdivision lots that remain without structures (therefore assisting in estimating supply and demand for empty subdivision lots). However, neither our feedback nor our evidence base was sought in the development of the Planning Statement.	Noted and thank you for the information and offer. This more detailed information will be more helpful at Area Plan stage. The Planning Statement is focused on defining Zones and Overlays which will only be applied to the map at Area Plan stage.	None
	6-551		We recognize that there are challenges with evidence-based decision making in Cayman and that there are severe data gaps across multiple sectors, including those outside the Planning Department's control. However, the National Planning Framework identified multiply areas where data and research were needed and in the six years since the drafting of that framework, we are not aware of any work done to progress those goals. Moreover, as the technical planning experts, the Planning Department has had over 25 years since the 1997 Development Plan to incrementally guide the country toward a more modern, sustainable approach to land use planning and to encourage the establishment of data collection mechanisms to provide the statistics needed to guide land-use planning in Cayman. A population uninformed about what proper planning entails can not be expected to provide the level of feedback currently being sought.	Noted. The NPF remains the overarching basis for the other stages of PlanCayman and the action items contained within the NPF (many of which are actions for other Government entities) will be continually reviewed. The role of PlanCayman is to incorporate this information as it comes forward.	None
	6-552		<p>2. Population Growth is the Elephant in the Room</p> <p>Population growth, housing needs, and traffic are three of the key issues facing Cayman. They are directly related and are the main forces guiding development in Cayman. The Planning Statement does not address these issues. It acknowledges them as challenges and opportunities we face (page 7), but does not establish limits, incentives, disincentives or policies to manage them. Age structure, demographics, housing needs, transportation planning and infrastructure requirements all need to be incorporated into an effective Planning Statement through the presentation of feasible scenario analyses. For example, key policies could be analysed against and an options appraisal presented for low medium and high growth rate scenarios drawn from planning frameworks in similar jurisdictions.</p>	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR22	6-553		<p>3. The Planning Statement Does Not Advance the Management of Impacts from Development</p> <p>We fully support the key strategic objectives of the Planning Statement on page 6, but the Planning Statement does not advance these or the management of development impacts. We believe the Planning Statement will only maintain the status quo. It is clear from the published feedback from the various district consultations that the public on the three islands are increasingly concerned about the uncontrolled and unmanaged nature of physical development and wish to see their concerns addressed in the Planning Statement.</p>	Noted. The Area Plan stage gives the public an opportunity to provide further input on their community and to apply zones, overlays and specific restrictions (i.e. building heights) within those zones	None
	6-554		<p>It is not clear how the policies in the Planning Statement will address or seek to address the issues of climate change, including those we are already experiencing. The Jersey Island Plan included climate change by first identifying climate change as one of their strategic policy areas and then proposing a number of policies and actions to address the impacts. Given the far-reaching effects of climate change on the Cayman Islands, we would have expected to see far more emphasis on how the Planning Statement will address this.</p>	<p>One of the Strategic Objectives of the draft Planning Statement is 'Climate Resilience: Incorporate risk reduction mechanisms and appropriate hazard management strategies'. Policies relating to Climate Change are incorporated throughout the draft Planning Statement, reflecting many of the policies included within the quoted Jersey Island Plan policy SP1. In the draft Planning Statement this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Section 3.8: Open Space Zones</u>: Preserve land for public enjoyment and protect them from non-recreational development - <u>Section 3.9: Coastal Mangrove Buffer</u>: Ensure the long-term protection of Mangrove Buffer areas from development - <u>Section 4.2: Natural Resource Preservation Overlay</u>: Ensure development is sensitive to natural resources and ecological features - <u>Section 4.6: Sensitive Coastline Overlay</u> - control development of highly vulnerable coastal areas and incorporate appropriate building, site and landscape design - <u>Section 5.4: Circulation and Transportation</u>: Support existing and future public transport operations and encourage conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel. - <u>Section 5.6: Design</u> Encourage resilient design as a protective measure against climate change, storm surge and sever weather events - <u>Section 5.7: Natural Resources and Coastline</u>: Minimise the impact of major development on the natural environment, ensure developments in coastal areas incorporate hazard risk reduction mechanisms 	None
	6-555		<p>4. How does this all tie in?</p> <p>The legal standing of this document in the context of the proposed structure of the Cayman Islands National Development Plan is very unclear.</p>	<p>Once approved in Parliament, the Planning Statement will become Government Legislation. However, the draft Planning Statement notes in section 3.1 that the 1997 Zoning Map and Zone definitions will remain in effect until such time as the new zones outlined in this Planning Statement come into effect through Parliament's approval of the relevant Area Plan and amended zoning. Also, section 5(3) of the Development and Planning Regulations states that where there is a conflict between Regulations and the Planning Statement, the Regulations shall prevail.</p> <p>Recommend text is added in section 1 to further clarify the legal status of the Planning Statement</p>	Add text section 1 to clarify legal status of Planning Statement when approved
	6-556		The National Planning Framework had more detail than this document but the 2024 Planning Statement is meant to be part of the 'detailed policy and guidance'	Section 1 of the Planning Statement explains the structure of PlanCayman and how the NPF remains the overarching basis for the other stages of PlanCayman. Section 1 also explains how the Planning Statement document relates to both the NPF and subsequent Area Plans.	None
	6-557		The status quo appears to be maintained until Area Plans are adopted.	The Planning Statement introduces new Zoning and Overlay categories, along with new Policy Considerations. It also provides the legal framework for the creation of Area Plans. The Area Plan stage gives the public an opportunity to provide further input on their community and to apply zones, overlays and specific restrictions (i.e. building heights) within those zones	None
	6-558		The 2024 Planning Statement does not include national policies and plans to hand down to the Area Plans. Area Plans will not be able to consider national needs because there is no national land-use planning to identify what should go where	Each Area Plan will be prepared in consultation with the community, stakeholders and government entities to ensure that zoning reflects any major infrastructure projects or other national needs. Since Cayman is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns the role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards.	None
	6-559		It is proposed to do two Area Plans per year, which seems very ambitious, but with 11 area plans, the legal 5-year plan review period will be exceeded.	Two Area Plans per year is an indicative timeframe, acknowledging that some Area Plans will be more complex than others. Resources can also be allocated to the process as necessary to ensure progress is maintained	None
	6-560		The existing regulations do not include the Area Plans or the new zones. Will the Regulations be updated to introduce the new zones? What is the timeframe for this update?	The Development and Planning Regulations will be updated to reflect the content of the Planning Statement. The timeframe for this has not yet been determined and is dependent on the approval of the Planning Statement in Parliament. This is also true in respect of Area Plans; the Regulations will be updated to reflect each Area Plan following their approval in Parliament	None
	6-561		The existing Regulations state, "These Regulations shall be read and interpreted having regard to the development plan, provided where there is a conflict between these Regulations and the Planning Statement for the Cayman Islands 1997, these Regulations shall prevail." How does this affect the new Planning Statement given the conflicts already identified? How does the Planning Statement hold weight if it can be reverted to the Development and Planning Regulations?	This line in the Development & Planning Regulations remains true and, as stated above, the Regulations will be updated to reflect the content of each stage of PlanCayman (Planning Statement and Area Plans) once they are approved in Parliament. This would reduce conflicts between the Regulations and the updated Planning Statement.	None

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-562		The 'Other Policy Considerations' seem very worthwhile but they appear to be 'floating' without a legal basis and it is not clear how they will be enforced or implemented. Will an objector be able to object to a development on the grounds that a development does not have 'appropriate aesthetics and compatibility with surrounding uses'?	The Other Policy Considerations will be incorporated into all aspects of PlanCayman. As above, if there is conflict between the Regulations and the Planning Statement then the Regulations shall prevail, but it is the intention to incorporate the 'Other Policy Considerations' into Area Plans and Regulations where possible.	None
	6-563		In the public consultation meetings, much has been made of the Area Plans as where the detail will be held. Area Plans are a key component of achieving any change with this policy, but since none have developed we cannot see whether or not they would include the expected information and level of detail.	Noted. The next stage of PlanCayman is the preparation of Area Plans, and each of these will involve full public consultation	
	6-564		5. The Planning Statement includes elements which are steps backwards from good land use planning. Single-family zoning is considered to be a restrictive land-use policy with well-documented detrimental effects on people and the environment (e.g. urban sprawl, transportation issues, lack of walkable neighbourhoods, no placemaking etc.). This Planning Statement introduces a new category of Single Family Residences and a new category of Estate Residential. The reasoning for these, especially in light of no evidence base being used to assess housing need, is unclear. There is no definition of single family residences and it would appear to exclude multi-generational residences, 'granny annexes', accessory dwelling units etc. These are a key cultural facet of Caymanian society and are not mentioned. If statistics are available to support the need for this single-family zoning, it would be helpful to provide this as part of the Planning Statement.	<p>Noted and appreciate the comment. Single Family Zoning is considered necessary in certain neighbourhoods due to the threat of multi-family housing projects affecting neighbourhood character and having an impact on traffic etc. It is recognised that a balance is needed and that certain areas will be more appropriate for higher density residential (i.e. those in closer proximity to highways, public transport, commercial uses etc), while others are more appropriate to maintain as existing. The introduction of this zoning category is considered to better define these neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Noted regarding definition of Single-family, this could be included in the definitions in the regulations, once the Planning Statement is approved in Parliament.</p> <p>Single family zoning is not appropriate zoning for accessory dwelling units. This is more appropriate in Low Density Residential zones</p> <p>The approach to multi-generational residences in ER and SFR zones will be considered by the Authority.</p>	NOTE: CPA to consider approach to multi-generational homes in ER and SFR zones.
	6-565		6. Lack of Definitions Create Difficulties with Accountability There is an overall lack of definitions which will allow the public to hold the Central Planning Authority accountable. For example, 'design standards' are not defined.	Design standards are typically set out in supporting guidelines documents (i.e. wall and fence guidelines etc). Locally-specific standards can be set out in Area Plans and, where appropriate, incorporated into Regulations	None
	6-566		There is still no obligation on developers to ensure that their development has a demonstrated need and will actually benefit the people of the Cayman Islands, and there are still no obligations on developers to manage their impacts on the people of the Cayman Islands. Every person in the Cayman Islands suffers from the impacts of development here, for example through increased traffic, while others profit off it. There is no way to encourage fairness. The argument could be made that the public of Cayman benefit from import duties, although import duties for larger developments are often waived. There are also infrastructure fees that are payable depending on the location and nature of proposed development, although without adequate planning it is impossible for those to achieve the intended purpose of the "development of roads, affordable housing and other infrastructure in the islands" whilst taking into accounts the needs of the general public.	As noted, development generates import duties, fees, stamp duty etc and, depending on the nature of the development, homes, commercial space, community and education facilities etc. Much of this is driven by the market and underlines the fact that Cayman is not a fixed planned society but instead is a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies.	
	6-567		Definitions could be improved to clearly define affordable housing, green building, adaptive reuse.	Noted. Definitions can be added to the Regulations in future	
	6-568		7. Sister Islands Area Plans may be useful for the Sister Islands because they are so far behind and may be a useful place to start. However, there are very few mentions of the Sister Islands-specific issues in this Planning Statement. There is no consideration of the way to optimize the character and development of each of them individually and together, for example. Therefore, the Planning Statement does not contain much which can aid in the shaping of those Area Plans. The document also makes note that Planning Zones identified will be "applied more flexibly in the Sister Islands". Some clarity as to what this means would be helpful.	<p>The issues specific to the Sister Islands will be considered in the respective Area Plans.</p> <p>Since zoning is a new concept for the Sister Islands, this reference on p.11 of the Planning Statement is an acknowledgment of this and that, subject to input from the community at the Area Plan stage, there may be a desire for more flexibility. This is to be determined in subsequent stages of the Plan Review.</p>	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
	6-569		<p>8. This Plan Does Not Reference Any Other National Policies or Plans</p> <p>The 2024 Planning Statement appears to have been developed in a silo and does not indicate how it intends to incorporate other national policies and plans such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Tourism Plan - National Energy Policy - Draft Climate Change Policy - National Cultural and Heritage Policy - Older Persons Policy - National Health Policy - National Solid Waste Management Strategy, 2016 - Food and Nutrition Security Policy - MCI and DOA's mapping of existing agricultural land <p>Reference to other national policies or plans would help prevent conflicting policy advice and also help reduce the risk of duplication of work.</p>	The Planning Statement has been drafted taking into account other national policies and plans. In order to ensure the Planning Statement remains concise it was not considered appropriate to reference all other documents	Consider adding list of approved National Policies as an appendix to the Planning Statement.
WR22	6-570				
WR23	6-571		I have been following the advancement of the plans to build a fake marina on the island of Cayman Brac. While I am not a resident of the islands, and just a tourist, I do live in a place that has experienced the kind of infrastructure, greed, and population explosion this project would support. I live in the state of Montana in the United States, and over the last ten years many of the places I have loved have fallen victim to property development interests which tout a greater good to provide people and community with opportunity and amenities. These opportunities increase the cost of living to a point where those people who are the backbone of providing services to all the new residents cannot afford rent, food or transportation. What is being proposed by this Zeus Port is an idealized plan to make another Grand Cayman.	Once a development meets the minimum requirement under law, the Planning Statement, CPA and DoP have no legal grounds to disapprove such a project. However, the current process of updating the Development Plan will facilitate input from the community and create a set of policies to guide future development in Cayman Brac.	
	6-572		The reason I visited and became enamoured with Cayman Brac was its remoteness, its wildlife, the reefs, the ecosystems and the rock climbing. These are all things I also enjoy in my state of Montana, and these are also things we continuously fight to protect from the same interests threatening Cayman Brac. The natural resources of Cayman Brac have value that cannot be quantified, that does not mean they are without value. It means they are priceless. Allowing development on this scale will threaten everything Cayman Brac currently is, was and could be. I understand the residents of the Brac would like more financial opportunities and access to improved facilities something like this project could provide. I believe there is a middle ground where tourism can be encouraged without the cost of the spirit of the island.	The Planning Statement is aimed at finding and supporting a balance between development and the environment via promoting sustainable development as stated in in Section 1.6 of the Planning Statement; "ensuring that all development seeks to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic considerations to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Through the Area Plans, the people of the Cayman Islands will help determine the character and zoning of the indicative areas.	
WR24	6-573		The initiative is coordinated by citizen representatives and public servants (Central Planning Authority, Development Control Board, Ministry with responsibility for Planning, Director of Planning and staff) who have the best interest of the Cayman Islands at heart. The parties mentioned include extensive expertise on the subject at hand, while publicly advocating that the initiative can only succeed via collaborative effort tapping into the aspirations, knowledge, expertise and feedback from stakeholders.	Noted	
	6-574		All parties involved should be commended for the fairly robust public consultation aimed to obtain as much input as possible from all stakeholders. Extending the deadline for input is further evidence of inclusivity effort.	Noted	
	6-575		In future, more social media presence is recommended to better capture young people's input. Also, future partnerships on Area Plans development via 'District Committees' would enhance inclusiveness and collective ownership	A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at subsequent stages of the Development Plan.	
WR25	6-576				
WR26	6-577		While rental properties are an important part of Cayman's tourism economy and can be a great way for local residents to earn extra money. However in areas like West Bay they are in effect removing many long term rental options from local residents, driving up the price of rentals for all. It is something that should be looked at in the residential and tourism zoning	<p>The draft Planning Statement acknowledges the challenge of 'supply and Cost of Housing' (section 2.5) along with the need to provide safe and comfortable housing options for all income levels (section 3.3).</p> <p>The Plan will incorporate other government initiatives such as the government's Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan, led by Ministry of PAHITD.</p> <p>Whilst the Airbnb concern maybe be valid, it is outside the remit of the Planning Statement.</p>	
WR27	6-578				

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR28	6-579		General In reference to statements such as this: "The Authority shall apply the Planned Area Development policies..." "The Authority shall apply the Agricultural Zoning (AG) policies, and other relevant policies of the Planning Statement, to..." Statements like these occur throughout the document. Recommend to clarify where the list of the policies relevant to each section can be found. It is somewhat confusing when referencing external policies or this document as the policy.	The wording in the Planning Statement indicates that decision-makers should refer to all relevant policies within the Policy Statement (acknowledging that many factors and policies influence a decision).	Consider adding list of approved National Policies as an appendix to the Planning Statement.
	6-580		Recommendation to also make consistent/clear what the CPA will and will not permit as this is very inconsistent throughout.	Specifics will be contained in Area Plans and resulting Regulations	None
WR29	6-581				
	6-582		The notification distances for many developments does not allow for landowners to comment on developments which will have impacts on them. These distances should be extended or rethought as many impacts are cumulative and/or indirect. Increased traffic in small neighborhoods would be one example.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-583		The time permitted for feedback is too short as many persons do not check their mail as frequently as they may have done in the past when there were few other options for communication.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-584		A major concern is the implementation and enforcement of the planning laws and policies and adherence to other laws that deal with planning and development. A lot is said about sustainable development but the very idea of EIAs are under attack by government agencies and ministers. EIAs are a standard in developed countries worldwide and a basic tool to ensure development is done in a way that considers the environmental, social, and economic costs. Will the planning authority commit to their use?	EIA processes are outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-585		What assurances can be given that this plan will be reviewed and updated? The previous plan was more than 20 years overdue for an update. How will there be accountability for those who are supposed to ensure that it is done?	Section 1.2 of the Draft Planning Statement explains the proposed review cycle of PlanCayman and that since Area Plans are intended to be prepared in a cascading sequence over the 5 year plan review period, it provides for a process of continuous review and community engagement. Resources will be allocated to the PlanCayman process as necessary to achieve delivery of the various stages and documents.	
	6-586		The notification distances for many developments do not allow for landowners to comment on developments which will have impacts on them. These distances should be extended or rethought as many impacts are cumulative and/or indirect and do not conform to the idea that only what is happening right next to your property is your business.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement	
	6-587		As noted by a member of the Public at the West Bay consultation, the NTCl used to have a seat on the Planning Board. This is something that could help to ensure that natural and built heritage are fully considered in planning decisions; and is well within the power given by the National Trust Law (2010) for the NTCl to advise government on the issues of protection of these national shared assets.	Member of the CPA / DCB is outside the scope of the Planning Statement consultation. All stages of the PlanCayman will be undertaken with full consultation with Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private). The proposed "Heritage Preservation Overlay' seeks to protect buildings and structures worthy of preservation. These will have to be determined with support from the National Trust for the Cayman Islands, other stakeholders and landowners at Area Plan stage.	
	6-588		An issue not addressed in this document is the fact that government projects are often planned without communication with other agencies, leading to projects that overlap, conflict, or have major cumulative impacts. A small example is the preferred cargo port option cutting off the existing coastal road in Breakers despite the fact that the EWA is supposed to ensure that there are two routes out east. How will this be addressed by planning policy?	As stated in section 5.5.2 of the Planning Statement, "the Authority and the Board shall.....support a coordinated multi-agency integrated approach to infrastructure development". Each Area Plan will be prepared in full consultation with infrastructure providers, allowing for consideration of how each Area Plan fits within wider strategic infrastructure plans.	
	6-589		Another major issue with the current planning process is the commonplace request for after the fact planning permissions, potentially contravening the careful planning of a national development law. How can this be addressed by the planning authority?	Provisions for After-the-fact planning approvals and penalties are set in Regulations, and outside the scope of the Planning Statement.	
	6-590		How are the different elements of the plan prioritized? Will environmental concerns be put aside to address economic concerns? Who will make the final determination?	The Draft Planning Statement seeks to achieve a balance between different activities and make more efficient use of resources. The purpose of this is to promote more desirable and sustainable economic, social and environmental outcomes. If priorities can be established and agreed for different areas in the Cayman Islands, these can be articulated in each Area Plan.	
	6-591		The concept of area plans is a good way to tailor the development plan for each of the many different communities in the Cayman Islands. The area plans should have extensive local consultation throughout as they are being developed. It is essential that each community has a say in what is important to them. This is at the heart of sustainability.	Noted. A variety of consultation methods will be considered to successfully engage the community at the Area Plan stage of the Development Plan. Each Area Plan will be prepared will full consultation with Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private).	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR30	6-592		With regards to 2.2, can sustainable development be achieved in Cayman while population growth continues at its rapid pace? Is this to the benefit of the Caymanian people? This is a concern that has been expressed by the National Trust membership, as well as the general public in the public consultation meetings. It has direct bearing on the need for development in Cayman.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-593		How will the supply and cost of housing be controlled as stated in 2.5. Will there be incentives to encourage the building of affordable housing? Or mandates in some areas? There has been little incentive for developers to build housing that doesn't maximize their profit. High end developments or those seen as investments for wealthy buyers are a better way for developers to make money and so they are what is built. Would there be restrictions on off island buyers or more incentives for developing for first time buyers?	Section 2.5 of the draft Planning Statement identifies a current problem that is being faced in the Cayman Islands regarding the supply and cost of housing. Section 3.3 defines the various residential zones that allow for a range of housing types to meet the needs for all income levels. Any consideration for incentives for affordable housing provision would be guided by the recommendations of the Public and Affordable Housing Policy & Ten-Year Strategic Plan currently being formulated by Ministry PAHITD.	
	6-594		What are policy ideas to create transit corridors as noted in 2.9? Effective mass transit would likely require government land purchase and investment	Section 5.4 of the Planning Statement indicates that existing and future public transport operations will be supported. Any issues relating to land purchase and investment to facilitate mass transit systems are outside the remit of the Department of Planning.	
	6-595		The Sister Islands have not had a zoning or development plan, giving a sense that decisions can be somewhat arbitrary. How will a balance be found between allowing flexibility with transparency and accountability for decision makers, and an understanding of what will be allowed or not. The NTCI membership in the Sister Islands has been concerned about the lack of planning in development on Little Cayman and Cayman Brac. The communities on those islands must be consulted about their area plans,	Section 1.4 of the Planning Statement outlines the purpose of Area Plans to provide a mechanism to implement national objectives and policies in a manner that is applicable to individual locations. Separate Area Plans are proposed for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. These Area Plans will be prepared in full consultation with Government Departments / Agencies and stakeholders (public and private). Once complete, Area Plans will detail zoning, overlays and any other policies that are required to meet the needs of those places.	
	6-596		which should be prioritized to account for the fact that they have no current plan.	The determination for the order in which the Area Plans will be conducted rests with Parliament. It is our recommendation that concerned residents reach out to their respective political representatives to make their cases heard.	
	6-597		Regarding Agricultural Zoning (3.2), what environmental protections will be in place. Currently, clearing of environmentally significant land for the purpose of agriculture seems to occur without any checks. There seems to be a thought that agriculture is not a major threat to environmentally significant lands, however inefficient agriculture can consume a great deal of land, water, lead to nitrogen pollution and other impacts. These must be considered by planning and not simply greenlit.	In accordance with s.7 of the Development and Planning Act, the Authority or Board shall to the greatest possible extent consult with Departments and agencies of the Government. This includes consultation with DoE / NCC under s.41 of the National Conservation Act.	
	6-598		Residential sprawl is a risk to the sustainability of Cayman. With a fast rising population and the local preference for large single family homes, Cayman is at threat of running out of space. There needs to be a national conversation about density, with the necessary infrastructure improvements.	Certain locations may be suitable for increased density, if they are served by adequate transportation and other infrastructure and/or where a mix of uses exist or can be encouraged. This is essential to make better use of land and to allow other areas to remain lower density or reserved for recreation / environmental uses. Appropriate locations will be considered as part of the preparation / consultation for each Area Plan.	
	6-599		Will there be a need analysis for any potential golf course development? Are the two existing courses at capacity? Golf courses require massive areas of land to be cleared for the recreation of a small wealthy segment of the population. They are also resource intensive, requiring water (And power to desalinate), fertilizer, etc. One possible suggestion would be to require an Audubon Certification for any golf course, so that it at least provides habitat for wildlife.	Information is not available to determine the capacity of existing golf facilities. As with any other planning application for a recreation facility, determination would be based on any relevant factors (i.e. noise, traffic, building heights, setbacks etc) and information gained from consultation with Government Departments under s.7 of the Development and Planning Act.	
	6-600		How often will the Land Subject to Acquisition be updated? How is it foreseen that this will affect land prices?	The purpose of the LSAO is to establish a method to designate property that the Government intends to acquire and to provide transparency to all concerned parties. As with other overlays, this will be applied to the zoning map during preparation of each Area Plan, and therefore will be reviewed as and when each Area Plan is reviewed.	
WR31	6-601		The current rapid development impacts the Cayman Islands' needs for infrastructure, not only for potable water production and supply and wastewater collection and treatment, but also for roads, seaports, airports, solid waste, hospitals, educational facilities and power generation. Recently these challenges were manifested in public discussions about project Regen, the East West Arterial, the new cargo port and Government's decision to have a referendum on cruise ship tourism. In the Water Authority's view the Statement needs to consider the development of an overall infrastructure plan based on projected development, rather than having isolated consultations for specific infrastructure projects. Such a plan would identify overall specific needs, levels of service, capital and operational cost and preferred locations for vital infrastructure.	<p>The Capital Improvement Programme remains a goal of the NPF (Goal 7.2 of the NPF), but requires a project champion to take it forward. this is outside the remit of the Planning Statement, CPA and DoP.</p> <p>The preparation of Area Plans will enable a review of the infrastructure requirements for different parts of the Cayman Island in consultation with infrastructure providers.</p>	

Respondent	Ref	Section ref	Comment	DoP Response (Ratified by CPA)	Suggested Amendment
WR32	6-602		The Planning Board and Department should have more policies handed down from the political directorate so that there are fewer decisions which are often made under pressure. Policies will dictate what needs to be done locking the department and the Board into doing the right thing.	Outside the remit of the Planning Statement.	
	6-603		Absolutely NO COASTAL MANGROVES SHOULD EVER BE REMOVED regardless of the reason.	Section 18 of the Development and Planning Regulations states that "All forms of development shall be prohibited in a Mangrove Buffer zone except in exceptional circumstances, and only where equivalent storm protection is provided by some other means and it can be demonstrated to the Authority that the ecological role of the peripheral mangroves will not be substantially adversely affected by the proposed development."	
	6-604		THERE SHOULD BE A COMPLETE MORATORIUM ON FOREIGN DEVELOPMENT. We have overdeveloped, so we don't need to slow down; we need to stop.	A moratorium on development approvals is outside the scope of the Planning Statement document. It is considered that this would likely have significant unintended negative impacts both on the economy, the cost of housing and land and potentially on persons quality of life	
	6-605		THERE SHOULD BE A PLAN TO REDUCE NOT INCREASE POPULATION. We have encouraged large developments which of course need people, then we need people and businesses to service those people we have imported. The Caymanian population can't deal with that so we encourage more foreign businesses and people. Visitors lament that they don't meet Caymanians. This is a vicious circle and Cayman is losing not gaining.	The Cayman Islands is not a fixed planned society and does not have established population growth patterns. The role of the Development Plan is to ensure a balance between different activities and articulate ways to achieve high quality of life standards. PlanCayman takes a performance based approach and seeks to identify community infrastructure needs based on the nature and scale of growth and development, rather than being predetermined by assumptions about population change. This supports Cayman's established role as a place that can grow flexibly in response to global economies while providing the necessary infrastructure to support a high quality of life.	
	6-606		In order to present some diversity, NO DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN THE KIMPTON AND THE WEST BAY CEMETERY SHOULD BE MORE THAN 5 STORIES. MANY, MANY VISITORS LONG FOR A DIFFERENT VIEW. The South is over populated, over built. Let the north be different.	Building height restrictions for each zone will be determined within each Area Plan to meet the particular needs of each place.	
WR33	6-607		NO RESPONSE SUBMITTED FOR THIS SECTION	N/A	