

Chapter 16 - Safe and Healthy Environment

Document Section Path	Potentially Polluting Development SE01
Document Part Name	SE01

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Barar		375			Support	<p>16 - Safe and Healthy Environment</p> <p>16.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. It should prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk of pollution by soil, air, water or noise or land instability, and remediate and mitigate despoiled, degraded, derelict contaminated and unstable land where appropriate. Consideration must be given to the impacts of noise on health and quality of life from new developments, and the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas.</p> <p>16.2 Environmental pollution and impacts on human health are important issues, and the Council is keen to ensure that Thanet's environmental quality is maintained and enhanced. The following policies aim to address a number of environmental issues to help achieve this.</p> <p>I wish to comment that this is a welcome stance by the Council Planning Authority and should be encouraged, throughout especially in areas, identified as strategic sites with the retention / creation of green corridors / wildlife corridors.</p>		1105		Email
Johnson	Elisabeth	51	Monkton Residents Association		Observation	Surely development where there is a potential to pollute should never be allowed under any circumstances.		607		Web
McNamara	Francis & Yvonne	183			Observation	With reference to Policy SE01, the council seem to be disregarding it's own policy in actively supporting a DCO for a cargo hub at Manston. Aviation fuel is the highest and most dangerous polluter in the world for land, air and noise, dust, vibration, heat, odour and health.		534		Web

Document Section Path	Landfill Sites and Unstable Land SE02
Document Part Name	SE02

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Johnson	Elisabeth	51	Monkton Residents Association		Observation	It would not seem sensible to allow development on Landfill sites or Unstable land for any reason.		608		Web
Ward	Linda	157			Observation	Monitoring and assessment of evidence must be stringent.		523		Web

Document Section Path	Contaminated Land SE03
Document Part Name	SE03

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Environment Agency		449			Object	Contaminated Land has a legal definition, we would recommend this policy wording is amended as follows to avoid confusion "Land Affected by Contaminated" In relation to contamination and groundwater protection we would recommend the following changes to wording in the Local Plan, see underlined wording below for suggested changes. Para 16.9 Some sites in Thanet are known to be affected by contamination. The allocation of sites should not be taken as an indication that they are free from any hazardous/physical constraints, or that they are not in the vicinity of other installations handling hazardous substances. Para 16.10 Development on land affected by contamination will require a site investigation and assessment to establish the levels of contamination present and identify any remedial measures that may be required to clean the site to make it suitable for its proposed end use and remediate risks to the wider environment. Para 16.11 A County-wide Contaminated Land Strategy should be reworded to Land Contamination Strategy is being prepared by the Kent & Medway Contaminated Land Forum and will form part of the evidence base for this Plan once it has been finalised. The strategy provides information across the county in place of former Planning Policy Statement 23 (PPS23). The Council also has a formal Contaminated Land Strategy for the district in relation to EPA 1990 Part IIa duties and requirements - this is currently being reviewed. Policy SE03 - Land affected by Contamination (amended heading) The heading for the policy needs to be amended for the reasons previously stated above.		1289		Email
Johnson	Elisabeth	51	Monkton Residents Association		Observation	The previous comment would appear to apply to this too, particularly as there have been instances of development on contaminated land that was supposed to have been rendered suitable for development and in fact people living in the developments there have been subject to health problems, so again it would appear that it should not be used.		609		Web

Document Section Path	Groundwater Protection Map 5 - Thanet's Groundwater Protection Zones SE04
Document Part Name	SE04

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Alexander	Richard	189			Observation	There does not seem to have been any consideration given to the fact that the Thanet Aquifer is already under pressure from the demands of existing housing and local enterprise (Thanet Earth, etc). The proposals would appear to have an adverse effect on groundwater supplies in that large areas of land, which currently supply the aquifer, will be under concrete whilst, at the same time, there will be a further 17,000 homes making demands on the water reserves. The historic Broadoak proposals failed due to lack of funding and there is no evidence that this situation has changed.	There are no details of what is proposed to deal with water supply in the future.	543		Web
Alexander	Christina	219			Observation	The construction of dwellings on the proposed scale will result in less rainfall filtering through to the underground reserves. This, coupled with the demands of a further 17,000 homes is bound to result in severe water shortages. Concreting over agricultural land may also lead to flooding in some areas due to the lack of drainage.	It is vital to include details of the source of future water supplies.	671		Web
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)		Object	<p>SUDS: At present, KCC is not content with the opening statement within paragraph 16.17. If drainage measures are built with direct contact to ground water and if water being discharged is not "clean", pollution may then be introduced into the groundwater system. Similarly, increased discharges may change groundwater flow and promote existing pollution migration. It is therefore important that any discharge to ground is reviewed and approved as to appropriateness. However, in one of the most water stressed areas within the country, it is not beneficial to not consider surface water as a water resource. KCC would recommend the following amendment:</p> <p><i>"Some methods of Sustainable Drainage can cause detriment to the groundwater. However, Well designed SuDs in suitable locations can improve the volume of groundwater available without affecting the quality; however locations and depths of discharge to ground -Therefore discharges to the ground must be carefully designed to ensure that they are appropriate and do not cause further degradation. SuDs must be designed so that pollutants are removed prior to discharge, and where possible, properly designed in order to improve the groundwater quantity."</i></p>		1532		Email
Environment Agency		449			Object	Policy SE04 - Groundwater Protection We suggest the following change to this policy for clarification purposes. "Proposals for development within the Groundwater Source Protection Zones Proposals for Sustainable Drainage systems Proposals for piled foundations must take account of disturbance of any ground to cause turbidity in water supply and to prevent creating pathways for contamination materials to reach the		1290		Email

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
						<p>groundwater beneath any sites impacted by contamination or landfill.”</p> <p>Please note: To meet strategic priority 5 Water supply and Foul drainage provision in a timely manner should be detailed, this is covered to some extent in Policy SP01 Implementation, Plan Implementation and Infrastructure, but should be made more explicit, as is transport infrastructure. Water supply or foul drainage provision can be a significant delayer of development and for foul drainage there are no real alternatives for large scale development sites in Thanet in relation to ensuring groundwater protection is not compromised.</p>				
May	Raymond	238			Observation	<p>I am putting a comment in this section on Groundwater protection as I can find nothing in the local plan which addresses the fact that Thanet is a "water stressed" area; namely, an area of relatively low rainfall with a vulnerable aquifer drainage system. This summer, of very hot conditions, coupled with long dry periods, has already demonstrated the precarious position we are in regarding water resources. The Council, in its local plan has made no contingency planning for future water shortages, that will become more common and severe in the future and would be exacerbated by the planned 17,000 planned houses, many with multiple bathrooms, and 50,000 plus people living here.</p> <p>It is more a question of the serious diminution of the groundwater aquifer than its potential pollution during the period of the plan.</p>		816		Web
Trotter	AR & PJ	388			Observation	<p>WATER SUPPLY</p> <p>Thanet is already a water stressed area. Last winter an application had to be made to top up the Bewl Water Reservoir from the River Medway. Development of houses on the agricultural land and Manston Airport could affect the water aquifers which are so important to Thanet's water supply.</p>		1149		Paper

Document Section Path	Air Quality Map 6 - Thanet Urban Air Quality Management Area SE05
Document Part Name	SE05

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Coombs	Joshua	292			Object	<p>Birchington Square is the most polluted spot in Thanet</p> <p>The proposed development and roads will encourage and attract more motorists into Birchington</p> <p>Building more roads and widening others simply attracts more cars. Cars fill spaces they are allotted. There will be a significant increase and vehicles on the roads and that means more Snarl ups. Regardless of Electric Cars there will still be an increased NUMBER of cars on the roads. Furthermore any link roads and people travelling to Thanet will still use the route they know, which is Canterbury Road.</p>		862		Web
Diack	Anne	159			Support	The Air quality along Paragon should be closely monitored, given the amount of dust that is blown up from development in the Royal Harbour.		439		Web
Diack	Anne	159			Support	The air quality along Paragon in Ramsgate is also poor. As well as activity in the Royal Harbour site area, buses frequently wait for several minutes with their engines running at the bus stops outside residential property built on the edge of the road.. Council strategy to be to develop a deterrent to discourage this kind of polluting activity.		440		Web
Holton	Susan	139			Observation	Re-opening Manston as a cargo hub will have a detrimental effect on air quality as acknowledged by RSP in their DCO documents. How are the council going to manage the emissions? It will spoil Thanet for tourism and increase deaths of residents and be detrimental to children. It should therefore not be permitted as the scale is way beyond what was there before.		368		Web
Jones-Hall	Samara	295			Observation	<p>The quality of life for Thanet residents is under threat from the proposed 24/7/365 cargo hub. The DCO applicant ("RSP") has clearly stated that <i>"significant adverse effects have been identified as being likely as a result of an increase in noise"</i> in Ramsgate, Manston, Wade, West Stourmouth and Pegwell Bay. The RSP proposal goes on to say <i>"aircraft noise would increase to a point where there would be a perceived change in the quality of life for occupants of buildings in these communities"</i>. In addition, to this there will be a huge increase in air pollution.</p> <p>The RSP's proposal will directly adversely and significantly affect the residents of Ramsgate whom already have a high incidence of poor</p>	<p>The Local Plan must support the mixed-use development of the former Manston airport site and allocate a specific purpose for the Manston site with regards to housing requirements and mixed-use development.</p> <p>This is line with Objective 2 of the Department for Environment: Food and Rural Affairs single</p>	902		Web

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
						<p>health and average life expectancy significantly lower than the figures for Kent as a whole.</p> <p>The impact of and congestion on road vehicles and HGVs used to transport air-cargo, workers, passengers and fuel travelling to and from the proposed airport on Kent's road transport infrastructure and the associated carbon, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions, noise and air pollution - on Thanet's and Kent's villages, towns and businesses has not been addressed by RSP or been subject to a Health Impact Assessment; and - on travel times for all East Kent stroke victims to reach stroke unit in time as the nearest stroke unit is likely to be moved to William Harvey Hospital in Ashford has not been addressed.</p> <p>This treats our land, our seas, our homes, our people, the very air that we Thanetians breathe, with the utmost contempt. We deserve better. Our children and grandchildren deserve better. They deserve to grow up breathing clean air, sleeping soundly at night, learning in some of the best schools in the country – and without noisy cargo planes flying overhead at less than 1,000ft at all hours, night and day.</p>	<p>developmental plan updated 23 May 2018, the National Planning Policy Framework updated July 2018 and its Local Plan policies including but not limited to SP02, SP09, SP12, SP21, SP23, SP34, SP36, E10, E05</p> <p>Commercial aviation is not viable at the Manston site.</p> <p>A 24/7/365 cargo hub will blight tourism, regeneration, economy, heritage, employment growth and health of Thanet residents.</p> <p>Further, the impact of and congestion on road vehicles and HGVs used to transport air-cargo, workers, passengers and fuel travelling to and from the proposed airport on Kent's road transport infrastructure and the associated carbon, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions, noise and air pollution - on Thanet's and Kent's villages, towns and businesses is unacceptable nor has it been subject to a Health Impact Assessment; and - nor have travel times for all East Kent stroke victims to reach stroke unit in time as the nearest stroke unit is likely to be moved to William Harvey Hospital in Ashford been addressed.</p> <p>Further, it is a brownfield site which could be used to meet a significant proportion of district's housing needs instead the draft Local Plan (endorsed by Thanet District Council but opposed by its officers) has pushed 2500+ houses to be built on Greenfield sites and</p>			

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
							<p>in areas with little or no additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Further, Official Nomis statistics show that employment in Thanet has grown 13.8% since the closure of Manston Airport. General employment growth in Thanet mirrors 23% jobs growth in Tourism since closure of Manston. We must continue to back winning strategy/proven success by investing in Heritage, Arts, Culture and Active Lifestyle related Tourism. A 24/7/365 cargo hub will blight - slow or reverse - this economic growth and employment growth.</p> <p>Further it will destroy and diminish Thanet's landscape character and local distinctiveness.</p>			
May	Raymond	238			Observation	The Council supports future aviation activity at Manston. As I have alluded to before, the only economically viable scenario is a 24/7 cargo hub. The affect on the air quality over large parts of Thanet, but particularly under the various flight paths, patterns, would be injurious to thousands of people. (Aircraft burn aviation fuel at a maximum level during take-off and landings). There would be no mitigation for maintenance of air quality as electrically (battered operated) flown aircraft are a long way into the future.		819		Web
Ward	Linda	157			Observation	Air quality is already compromised around the Birchington Square area.		524		Web

Document Section Path	Noise Pollution Table 14 - Noise Hierarchy SE06
Document Part Name	SE06

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Barar		375			Object	<p>Noise Pollution</p> <p>16.29 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines that local plan policies and development management decisions should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development. It states that where conflict does arise, impacts must as far as possible be mitigated against and be reduced to a minimum.</p> <p>16.30 The Government's Noise Policy Statement for England stated priority is to: 'Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from environmental, neighbour and neighbourhood noise within the context of Government policy on sustainable development'.</p> <p>16.31 The second aim is to mitigate and minimise adverse impacts, and the third is to contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life through effective management control of noise.</p> <p>16.32 Noise is a material consideration when determining planning applications. The Governments National Planning Practice Guidance[i] states that consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; • Whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and • Whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved. <p>Policy SE06 - Noise Pollution</p> <p>In areas where noise levels are relatively high, permission will be granted for noise-sensitive development only where adequate mitigation is provided, and the impact of the noise can be reduced to acceptable levels. Development proposals that generate significant levels of noise must be accompanied by a scheme to mitigate such effects, bearing in mind the nature of surrounding uses. Proposals that would have an unacceptable impact on noise-sensitive areas or uses will not be permitted.</p> <p>I wish to comment that this is a welcome stance by the Council Planning Authority and should be encouraged, throughout especially in areas, identified as strategic sites with the retention / creation of green corridors / wildlife corridors. However, in evidencing a concern on this policy, I feel the council could go further with regards to the prevention of noise pollution. Please see the following link: https://www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk/documents/noise%20guidance%20for%20new%20developments.pdf</p> <p>As a guidance note in this Scottish government document, please may I draw attention to point 4.7 which states "For the purposes of this guidance exceptional circumstances are considered to be proposals which aim to promote sustainable development and transport within the Local</p>		1106		Email

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
						Authority area and which would provide benefits such as: (a) reducing urban sprawl (b) reducing uptake of greenfield sites” I consider it regrettable that our council should not consider an effective dampener of noise pollution – the backdrop of the natural environment by retaining green corridors / wildlife corridors.				
eaves		188			Support	I hope that the extremely loud noise that will be generated by the noisy dirty cargo flights in and out of Manston will be taken into consideration. It may be difficult to encourage tourists to stay the night in Thanet if it gets approval.		545		Web
Holton	Susan	139			Observation	RSP have admitted that construction and operation of a cargo hub at Manston will involve significant levels of noise pollution. Under the Local Plan proposals there can be no justification to inflict this on residents. RSP plans give little or no protection from noise (especially at night) to any residents - far less than comparable airports. There are many reports proving the damage to health of even low level noise - the airport would generate levels far above anything we have ever experienced in Thanet before. If this Local Plan is passed then the airport should automatically be stopped.		369		Web
May	Raymond	238			Observation	The Council supports future aviation activity at Manston. As I have alluded to before, the only economically viable scenario is a 24/7 cargo hub. The affect on the noise pollution over large parts of Thanet, but particularly under the various flight paths, patterns, would be injurious to thousands of people. Noise levels are at their highest during take-off and when landing (engines used as braking device). Noise pollution from such an airport would have a serious impact upon peoples' sleep, health and general well-being. RSP's mitigation proposals in their Manston DCO at 63 decibels, averages over a 16 hour period are well above the Government's threshold of 51 decibels where "noticeable and intrusive " noise occurs (LOAEL).		821		Web
N		257			Object	Night Flights will impact on the noise in Thanet impact greatly. The quota count allowing QC4 planes would be extremely detrimental to Ramsgate. How does this tally with the above statement?		918		Web
Warner	Barbara	198	Mrs		Support	How does TDC councillors support, for a company seeking a DCO for opening a cargo Hub at the former airport site sit with the Government's noise policy, or TDC Noise pollution policy.? Cargo planes over Ramsgate town would surely be, Noticeable and disruptive = avoid and even worse, Noticeable and very disruptive = Prevent		873		Web

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Warner	Chris	291	mr		Support	All the effects of a cargo hub operation at Manston Airport must, surely, come under the heading of 'Noticeable and Very Disruptive', to be 'Prevented', in accordance with the Government's Noise Prevention Statement for England and Wales upon which this Local Plan is based. For the Planning Inspectorate to sanction a DCO and TDC facilitate the opening of the site as a cargo hub would be in direct contravention of these stipulations and, as such, unthinkable.		883		Web

Document Section Path	Noise Pollution Table 14 - Noise Hierarchy SE07
Document Part Name	SE07

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Barar		375			Object	<p>Noise Action Plan Important Areas</p> <p>16.35 Noise Action Plans have been prepared in line with the terms of the Environmental Noise Directive and cover noise from roads, railways and agglomerations. There are 26 road related 'Important Areas' and 2 rail Important Areas in Thanet. (These correspond with hotspots identified in the AQMA).</p> <p>16.36 Within the identified areas, residential development will need to include mitigation measures to reduce the impact of noise on residential amenity. Such measures may include screening/barriers, double glazing, locating windows so they are not opposite the noise source. Developers should liaise with Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to agree appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Policy SE07 - Noise Action Plan Important Areas</p> <p>Proposals for residential development within identified Important Areas in the Noise Action Plan must incorporate mitigation measures against the impact of noise on residential amenity.</p> <p>I wish to comment that this is a welcome stance by the Council Planning Authority and should be encouraged, throughout especially in areas, identified as strategic sites with the retention / creation of green corridors / wildlife corridors. However, in evidencing a concern on this policy, I feel the council could go further with regards to the prevention of noise pollution. Please see the following link: https://www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk/documents/noise%20guidance%20for%20new%20developments.pdf</p> <p>As a guidance note in this Scottish government document, please may I draw attention to point 4.7 which states "For the purposes of this guidance exceptional circumstances are considered to be proposals which aim to promote sustainable development and transport within the Local Authority area and which would provide benefits such as: (a) reducing urban sprawl (b) reducing uptake of greenfield sites"</p> <p>I consider it regrettable that our council should not consider an effective dampener of noise pollution – the backdrop of the natural environment by retaining green corridors / wildlife corridors.</p>		1107		Email

Document Section Path	Light Pollution Table 16 - Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations - General Observers SE08
Document Part Name	SE08

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Barar		375			Observation	<p>Light Pollution</p> <p>16.37 Light pollution is identified as a statutory nuisance under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005. Poorly designed or installed lighting can be obtrusive by introducing a suburban character into rural areas, and also wastes electricity. Different forms of light pollution are identified as:</p> <p>Light Spillage - artificial illumination that results in the spillage of light that is likely to cause irritation, annoyance or distress to others</p> <p>Light Trespass - the spilling of light beyond the boundary of the property on which the light source is located</p> <p>Light Glare - the uncomfortable brightness of a light source when viewed against a dark background</p> <p>Sky Glow - the brightening of the night sky above our towns and cities</p> <p>16.38 Due to Thanet's open landscapes and vast skies, poor outdoor lighting can have a substantial adverse effect on the character of the area well beyond the site on which the lighting is located.</p> <p>16.39 Inappropriate lighting has been shown to have major impacts on wildlife. The impacts of light pollution on bat species and potential mitigation measures are particularly well documented.</p> <p>The policy concludes:</p> <p>Policy SE08 - Light Pollution</p> <p>Development proposals that include the provision of new outdoor lighting or require specific lighting in connection with the operation of the proposed development will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>It has been designed to minimise light glare, light trespass, light spillage and sky glow through using the best available technology to minimise light pollution and conserve energy;</p> <p>There is no adverse impact on residential amenity and the character of the surroundings;</p> <p>There is no adverse impact on sites of nature conservation interest and/or protected and other vulnerable species and heritage assets;</p> <p>There is no adverse impact on landscapes character areas, the wider countryside or those areas where dark skies are</p>		1108		Email

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
						<p>an important part of the nocturnal landscape; It does not have an adverse impact on long distance views or from vantage points;</p> <p>Where appropriate, mitigation measures are proposed. In addition a lighting strategy may be required for large developments or those developments with specific lighting requirements or for those that are in or adjacent to sensitive locations.</p> <p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required for proposed developments that fall in to the E1 category.</p> <p>Proposals that exceed the Institute of Lighting Professionals standards will not be permitted.</p> <p>I wish to comment that this is a welcome stance by the Council Planning Authority and should be encouraged, throughout especially in areas, identified as strategic sites with the retention / creation of green corridors / wildlife corridors. However, in evidencing a concern on this policy we already have the second brightest night time manmade construction in situ in the United Kingdom – Thanet Earth. SP14 will not only add to the light pollution in Birchington plus I doubt there will be many estate agency property viewings in the evenings, once Birchington’s housing expansion is completed as SP14 backs right onto Thanet Earth. The whole subject from a natural, ecological and human point of view needs to be reviewed sensitively.</p>				
Environment Agency		449			Object	<p>Light Pollution The Institution (not Institute, as written) of Lighting Professionals https://www.theilp.org.uk/home/ has recently updated its guidance on the impact of light on bats: https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificiallighting/. This should be added as a reference to the Local Plan. Although this section references the impacts of light pollution on wildlife and mentions bats, migratory fish are also affected by direct and indirect light. Consideration must be given to any water side lighting so that lights • are only installed when absolutely required • are of low light intensity • directed away from water • set as low as possible • controlled by motion sensitive switches, which also reduces wastage so that they only operate when needed • are equipped with back scatter guards</p>		1291		Email
Johnson	Elisabeth	51	Monkton Residents		Observation	<p>Has anyone looked at the light pollution from Thanet Earth!! Certainly Point 5 of Policy SE08 wasn't taken into</p>		610		Web

Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
			Association			consideration.				
Solly	C	419			Object	[See attached]	Statement required on the effects of light pollution from Thanet earth (2nd highest brightness value in England), Westwood, Ramsgate Port and Marina and an investigation on the effect of the rural areas around Birchington, St Nicholas and Monkton. This should be captured as a statement in the local plan. Areas of Westwood and Ramsgate port and Marina should consider tighter guidelines for development and exterior lighting. New Road and streetlights must conform to the standards of this policy. No further development permitted at Thanet Earth until resolution to the Light Pollution problem which currently exists. Consider restricting the use of Led lights to produce only warm light or use narrow spectrum LEDs	1257	Solly SE08 comments.pdf(1.6 MB)	Email
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Support	Policy SE08 - Light Pollution We support the inclusion of the caveat at clause 3 protecting designated nature conservation sites and protected species from increased light pollution.		1482		Email
Ward	Linda	157			Observation	What sort of Assessment allowed the light pollution caused by Thanet Earth?		525		Web