

Chapter 2 - Town Centre Strategy

Town Centre Strategy SP06										
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
Alltoft	Wendy	196			Observation	In order to support the town centres and tourist trade the council need to be mindful of the damage they do by implementing ridiculously high parking charges which deters both locals and tourists from coming to the area. How can local businesses survive if the council drive away their trade by increasing parking charges.		569		Web
Bates	John	226			Object	The Coastal Town Centres and District Centres need supporting over and above Westwood. The latter has been a disaster for the more localised places which has impacted so many small local businesses and their customers.	Support the Coastal Town Centres and District Centres in preference to Westwood.	706		Web
Bates	Alison	268			Object	Westwood Cross has been the death of the three local town centres and also impacted negatively upon the surrounding villages. Policies should be to enhance the business opportunities for the existing town centres (and the surrounding villages) and encourage people to 'shop local'. Westwood Cross is not easy to get to by many people so the limited public transport necessitates the use of a car. The only problem with that is that the roads around Westwood Cross are gridlocked most of the time already and there are moves to increase the numbers of houses in Thanet. So centre the efforts on the towns and not Westwood.	Support town centres and not Westwood Cross	808		Web
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)		Object	<p>TOWN CENTRE STRATEGY PRoW and Access Service</p> <p>KCC acknowledges that the Ramsgate to Whitstable stretch of the England Coast path has been approved by the Secretary of State. Work is currently underway to establish this section of the path on the ground. It is expected that this path will open in 2019, securing access rights for the public to explore and enjoy the coast. Therefore, the Local Plan should consider the existence of the England Coast Path, as Coastal Access rights should have come into effect by the time the new TDC local plan is adopted.</p> <p>Emergency Planning Resilience</p> <p>KCC recommends that the following amendments could be made to the paragraph to ensure resilience considerations are included within Local Plan:</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should be positive and promote competitive and resilient town centre environments and set out policies for their management and growth over the plan period. Plans should recognise town centres as the heart of the community and pursue their vitality, viability, sustainability and resilience. A network of centres should be defined that reflects the relationship between them in order to guide future development.</p>		1493		Email

Davies	Julie	147	CPRE Kent		Object	<p>Comments on behalf of CPRE Kent Thanet District Committee.</p> <p>The Lichfields Thanet Retail and Leisure Assessment 2018 (Update, 5 January 2018) has been based on an adjusted OAN that has been increased from 15,660 in the 2016 Assessment Update to 17,140 and the population within the study area is expected to increase over the plan period by 27,583 (+20.5%). The recent 2016-based ONS population projection predicts a growth of 25,393 (+18.9%) for Thanet District. Whilst the ONS 2016-based household projection for district identifies a lower growth of 14,811 households.</p> <p>The population figures used in the 2018 Assessment are higher than the 2016-based ONS population projections for the District by +3.22% at 2016, +4.52% at 2021, +6.3% at 2016 and +7.94% are 2031. This has implications for the capacity figures set out in Table 11 of the assessment. Given the significant reduction in population and household estimates it will be necessary to reconsider the retail floorspace figures.</p> <p>For convenience floorspace the 2031 figure of total available goods expenditure (£m) falls to around £311 close to the updated 2021 estimate of £309.69. This suggests that the convenience floorspace capacity for 2031 is likely to be similar to the 2021 figures namely - 1,795 sqm net and -2565 sqm gross. This implies that there will be no need for additional convenience floorspace.</p> <p>With regards to comparison floorspace the 2031 figure of total available goods expenditure falls to around £633 implying a slight reduction in floorspace need.</p> <p>The food and beverages 2031 of total available goods expenditure (£m) falls to around £179 close to the updated 2026 estimate of £175.24. This suggests that the food and beverages floorspace capacity for 2031 is likely to be similar to the 2026 figure of 2,579 sqm gross.</p>		380		Web
Dunn	Danielle	499	Broadstairs & St.Peter's Town Council		Object	<p>2.3 The Town Council object to Westwood Cross being referred to as a primary Centre</p> <p>The Town Council does not endorse the policy of placing Westwood at the top of the retail hierarchy in Thanet, above the pre-existing town centres (Broadstairs, Margate, Ramsgate).</p> <p>Westwood should be for retail only, and even then not developed so as to harm the pre-existing towns.</p> <p>Westwood should be treated on the same level as the older town centres; or less favourably than the older town centres, in order to allow them to recover.</p>		1395		Email
Margate Estates		460	Margate Estates	Zena Foale-Banks - Nexus Planning	Object	<p>Policy SP06 generally addresses provision for town centre uses across Thanet's main town centres. The supporting text to this policy identifies that there is capacity within the District for additional comparison, convenience and A1-A5 specific floorspace. The text further identifies that convenience retailing is currently skewed towards larger, out of centre outlets and that the Council would like to encourage more convenience provision within the coastal town centres. We therefore recommend that the Council identify that in some cases these stores may be located in areas outside of designated Primary and Secondary Frontages, such as within the</p>		1314		Web

						Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm, or in future development within designated Opportunity Sites. This could then be further expanded and justified in the area specific policies, including SP08, specific to Margate, ensuring the policies are unambiguous. It is acknowledged that these convenience facilities should not directly compete with the retail offer contained within Margate's Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages.				
Newing	April	322	Dover District Council		Support	Retail Capacity and Requirements With regard to the potential impact associated with forecast retail capacity and DDC's concerns in relation to the proposed level of retail provision at Westwood and the potential impact on Dover's retail function, the District Council supports TDC's commitment to share any relevant topic paper regarding revised retail figures and would welcome early engagement on this.		982		Email
Repsch	John	126			Support	By safeguarding and sustaining Westwood, this new-town is feeding on the coastal towns. Because of this and online shopping, Cliftonville and half of Margate are ghost towns. Westwood needs restraining.		403		Web
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council		Support	Westwood has become too developed for the road infrastructure. This needs a planning policy before more development.		262		Web
Solly	C	419			Object	It appears that other retail areas within the urban confines are not represented. As Birchington, Westgate, Garlinge and other areas are in the urban confine, shouldn't these areas be represented also? Also the traditional shopping area in Cliftonville is unfairly misrepresented here. The area requires action, help and regeneration to promote this area for retail and should be considered a Primary Frontage. The area was one of the more prominent areas to shop, certainly comparable to Margate. A new policy to deal with the regeneration of Cliftonville should be included or at least understand the issues facing the area. The policy may miss some other opportunities for those town centres. It should be noted it is unfair to create a transport system that only considers Westwood as a place to shop. The established town centres of Ramsgate, Margate and Broadstairs have had difficulty in being sustainable since Westwood Cross was opened. However Westgate and Birchington have thrived with the challenges they have had. It is possible that this Local Plan could affect the retailers in these local locations. Chapter 7 of the NPPF 2018 sets clear policy on the established town centres, I don't see this being represented in this policy. The identity of Westwood isn't clear to know if this is a retail park or a new town. Retail is in an economic change and there are risks to the traditional way of shopping. I don't see any statement regarding online services, distribution of goods (to the retailer or at a private address). The effects of the 29th March 2019 (Brexit) is not fully understood and could require amendment to deliver the policy effectively.	Cliftonville should be considered as a prominent town centre and requires specific support in planning to help its regeneration.	1197		Email
Thompson	Andrew	162	Canterbury		Observation	As regards retail, we recognise the draft plan's objective to maintain		476		Email

			City Council		market share and indeed that much of the retail floors pace required is already permitted.				
--	--	--	--------------	--	---	--	--	--	--

Westwood SP07										
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
.		408	Tesco Stores Ltd	Mark Buxton - RPS	Object	<p>We have concerns with the Thanet Reach part of Policy SP07. Most of the site is allocated for employment and education uses however we submit that the Council should adopt a more flexible approach to this allocation to enable it to be developed in a viable form. Eurokent, another allocation in Policy SP07, is allocated for mixed use development including 'flexible' business uses and we consider that the same approach should be adopted for Thanet Reach albeit with further flexibility built in. We consider that the allocation for land north of Millennium Way should also be promoted for other uses such as residential development. It should therefore be allocated as a mixed use area in the same vein as Eurokent.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 22 states:  "Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities."</p> <p>We welcome that the southern part of the 'Thanet Reach' site is allocated for residential development. However, we consider that the allocation references should be clearer. As referred to in the Preferred Options consultation and Proposed Revisions of the Local Plan we continue to consider that it is misleading to afford these sites the following addresses in Appendix B to the Local Plan when they lie adjacent to one another, and presumably should fall within the Broadstairs area:  'Land off Northwood Road, Ramsgate' (S536) and;  'Thanet Reach Southern Part' (SS34).</p> <p>Given the elapse of time since our previous representations we consider that delivery of the first residential units in 2021/22 is slightly pessimistic but not unreasonable.</p> <p>We also contend that land north of Millennium Way (i.e. the Thanet Reach employment allocation) is suitable for and capable of delivering much needed residential units, and should benefit from a more flexible allocation accordingly.</p> <p>We therefore object to the northern part of the site being allocated for employment uses. We consider that this should be allocated for residential development as both sites should be delivered together.</p> <p>Furthermore, for clarity, the sites should be referenced as land</p>	<p>Modify policy SP07 to identify Thanet Reach as a Mixed Use Area suitable for residential development, and apply a more flexible approach to the allocation of land north of Millennium Way to enable its viable redevelopment (including provision for housing).</p> <p>Amend the references to sites S536 and SS34 in Appendix B to avoid confusion and reflect the fact they are adjoining sites.</p>	1185		Email

						north of Millennium Way and land south of Millennium Way. We had understood the Council had acknowledged and accepted this point and the proposed change so it is unclear why these misleading references are still being used.				
Alan Byrne/English Heritage		155			Observation	Policy SP07 - see note below regarding Heritage Impact Assessments. We are unsure about the potential effects the development of sites in the Eurokent site allocation will have on adjacent heritage assets notwithstanding the references to a masterplan for the area. If individual sites come forward in advance of an approved masterplan it is not certain that assessments of impacts on heritage will take place, north at cumulative effects can be taken into account.		427		Email
Bates	John	226			Object	the road structure to and through Westwood should be dual carriageway to accommodate all the vehicles that even now tail back more than half a mile during the day and even worse at weekends and rush hour! Westwood is now often a place to avoid or requires a long detour to avoid to get anywhere else; not one to travel to if it can be helped		708		Web
CD10 Properties Limited		494	CD10 Properties Limited	Burnett Planning - Burnett Planning	Object	<p>SP07 and policies map</p> <p>Support for Policy SP07 in principle in supporting Westwood as a mixed use business and residential community.</p> <p>Object to implied policy that "oil" development (in the vicinity of Westwood) will be required to "secure implementation" of the Westwood Area SPD and Westwood Relief Scheme. It is not clear how individual proposals could "secure implementation" with an SPD or whether it is necessary for every proposal to "secure implementation" with the SPD. It would be more appropriate to refer to "being consistent with" or "not prejudicing" the objectives of the Westwood Area SPD and Westwood Relief Scheme</p> <p>There is insufficient justification for and explanation of the timing/costs/viability of the Westwood relief scheme in the draft plan. And in any event only new development that will generate significant additional traffic should be subject to any policy requirement to contribute to highway improvements.</p> <p>1) Westwood Town Centre</p> <p>Support the principle of Westwood Gateway Retail Park and Westwood Retail Park being located within the Westwood Town Centre boundary and as such being part of the preferred location for main town centre uses at Westwood The Policy states that "Retail development will be directed to the core town centre area at Westwood and complementary town centre uses will be accommodated within the wider town centre boundary, as defined by the primary and secondary frontages. Any development proposals should ensure there is no net loss in overall commercial floorspace."</p> <p>The effect of this wording is unclear because the online Policies Map does not refer to, or identify, a "core town centre area at Westwood" nor does it identify a "town centre boundary".</p> <p>The online Policies Map identifies in the "Map Layers" page a "Westwood Primary Frontage" as a hatched area annotation and</p>	<p>There is insufficient justification for and explanation of the timing/costs/viability of the Westwood relief scheme in the draft plan. And in any event only new development that will generate significant additional traffic should be subject to any policy requirement to contribute to highway improvements.</p> <p>The effect of this wording is unclear because the online Policies Map does not refer to, or identify, a "core town centre area at Westwood" nor does it identify a "town centre boundary".</p> <p>To be effective the Policies Map should identify a Town Centre boundary at Westwood. Westwood Gateway Retail Park and Westwood Retail Park must continue to be located within the town centre boundary given that they already function as part of the Town centre. To avoid confusion and potential inconsistency with other policies, Policy SP07 should clearly state that main</p>	1382		Email

					<p>also a linear "Primary Frontage" annotation, and a "Westwood Secondary Frontage" as a hatched area annotation and also a linear "Secondary Frontage" annotation. However, the Policies Map itself only identifies the "Westwood Primary Frontage" area and "Westwood Secondary Frontage" area.</p> <p>The Policies Map does not appear to annotate any linear Primary Frontages or Secondary Frontages.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the "core town centre area" at Westwood is intended to be represented by the "Westwood Primary Frontage" area and the "wider town centre boundary" is intended to be represented by the "Westwood Secondary Frontage".</p> <p>The reference to "Retail development will be directed to the core town centre area at Westwood" is also confusing because it could be misinterpreted as giving first preference to locating retail development within the "Westwood Primary Frontage" area. However, this is clearly not the intention of the Policy as such an interpretation would be inconsistent with Policy EDS which states that-</p> <p>"Proposals for main town centre uses should be located within the designated town centres of Margate, Ramsgate, Broadstairs and Westwood, comprising the primary and secondary frontages."</p>	<p>town centre uses will be supported within the defined Town Centre boundary at Westwood "in accordance with Policy E04 and Policy E05".</p> <p>"Primary and Secondary Frontages" can be defined within the Town Centre boundary in order to make Policy E04 effective.</p> <p>The reference to "Any development proposals should ensure there is no net loss in overall commercial floorspace" should be deleted as this text ignores qualitative factors whereby redevelopment to provide modern more attractive and more efficient buildings can maintain and improve footfall regardless of any reduction in quantity of floorspace. It would also be onerous to require more floorspace to be provided than is commercially required</p>			
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)	Object	Emergency Planning and Resilience: KCC recommends that TDC considers the 25 Year Environment Plan to deliver environmental benefits in the expansion of the Eurokent masterplan.		1494		Email
Johnson	Elisabeth	51	Monkton Residents Association	Observation	Too much development for the current road networks		124		Web
Jull		9	Deal & Walmer Chamber of Trade	Support	Categorising Westwood Cross as a town centre is a blatant attempt to circumvent planning policies to allow and encourage further retail development to the detriment of nearby genuine town centres including those outside Thanet district. It has all the attributes, and only the attributes of, a retail park and should be treated for planning policy as a retail park.		17		Web
McNamara	Francis & Yvonne	183		Observation	<p>While we feel that Westwood Cross has benefited Thanet by having larger retailers that wouldn't have fitted into town centres and created employment, the fact that it has free parking and also smaller well known retailers has had a detrimental affect on Ramsgate, Margate and Broadstairs town centres as most of them have moved to Westwood Cross.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the council's proposals to take an out of town development and turn it into a new town centre called Westwood will lead to more pressure on an already over congested road network. This is the main thoroughfare in which the three main towns (Ramsgate, Margate and Broadstairs) and Thanet's main hospital, the QEOM are accessed. We feel the proposed road infrastructure, the Westwood Relief Road, won't be</p>	<p>The proposed road infrastructure should be reassessed as it is not adequate as it stands at the moment. The council should be concentrating on finding a way to access the hospital and town centres without having to go through Westwood but around it.</p>	797		Web

						enough to combat the amount of proposed housing, schools, doctors and Westwood Cross traffic.			
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council		Object	Westwood Cross has got too large, and now the roads etc cannot cope with the amount of movements. We have spoken to many residents and they consider WWX a no go area for the elderly. There is not a good enough range of shops, mostly aimed at young people, and of course the matter of a roof over the shops would have been a good idea. WWX is not a favoured option for my shopping		26	Web
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council		Object	Road infrastructure is appalling for residents and visitors.		263	Web
samme	terence	140			Object	Any further development at Westwood will remove the previous "green wedge" that existed between Margate, Broadstairs and Ramsgate, which was instigated by previous Councillors for the benefit of the whole area.		351	Web
Solly	C	419			Object	Paragraph 2.15 states that Westwood Cross (WWX) was a piecemeal retail development. I disagree that this has changed and improved since the time it was opened. Many retailers have moved to Canterbury (Mothercare, mamas and papas, 5 Guys, some retailers to name a few) Westwood Cross was developed to stop this from happening but clearly it is not working. The development was badly placed and designed and was stated as an out of town shopping centre. Now it seems this is a new town shopping centre without understanding what the town/village Westwood actually is. Due to its placement right in the middle of Ramsgate, Broadstairs and Margate, this has created many issues for transport in the area. Money from the "Growth without Gridlock" program has not stopped gridlock and shows of strain in the area from traffic, which also affects access to Broadstairs. It has been stated in from the transport planning in a Transport meeting that the Haine road (the feed from Ramsgate) is at capacity. The money spent appears not have improved highway links. Westwood has now become a maze of roundabouts which is confusing and unsightly with little consideration of appearance (landscaping not considered). However the issue remains of the fundamental error of where the new shopping centre/experience was placed in Thanet. Piecemeal development is quoted again in Paragraph 2.21 and will be addressed by a new planning document after the Local Plan has been adopted. However development has been already approved for the housing, it appears to me that this is not a transparent process and even at examination we will not know what fundamentally will happen to Westwood Cross especially with sustainable transport options. Surrounding areas of Thanet will now be affected by Westwood Cross with the new highway policy and will cause congestion much in a similar way to what has happened to Haine Road. Westwoods location as a prime retail area is fundamentally flawed.	Policy should be clear on what Westwood is, is this a new settlement or a addon to a out of town shopping centre.	1198	Email
Ward	Linda	157			Observation	Road infrastructure there is already unsustainable. There should be		435	Web



						no more building on agricultural land.			
Ward	Linda	157			Support	No further building on agricultural land.		436	Web

Margate SP08										
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
.		430	Citi Nests Ltd	Mike Goddard - Goddard Planning Ltd	Object	<p>We support the council's vision to build on Margate's success as a fashionable seaside resort. We think it is appropriate to include a specific policy relating to the Lido. Paragraph 2.28 recognises that The Lido is run down and in a most important strategic location close to the Margate Winter Gardens and The Turner Contemporary. It is also an important heritage asset. This paragraph and policy SP08 rightly recognise that this heritage asset is in need of significant restoration and repair and that should be the main focus for any redevelopment proposals. The current adopted Local Plan also contains a site specific policy, T5 but more than 12 years on there has been no restoration. The need to address the further decline of the Lido is now even more pressing, more urgent. However, in dealing with The Lido under sub-paragraph 6 of the policy, the policy itself only supports leisure and tourism related uses. Again, we accept that the policy must ensure that future development does not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites, either directly or as a result of increased visitor pressure. Consequently, mitigation will be necessary. Furthermore, we support the requirement that any development respects and restores the site's status as a significant heritage asset.</p> <p>Our key criticism of this draft Policy SP08 is that the naming of uses identified to leisure and tourism will not in themselves generate the substantial capital sufficient to support the long overdue restoration of a heritage asset which is in a very poor physical state and derelict condition. This is a significant and unjustified change from the current policy in the 2006 adopted Local Plan. Local Plan Policy T5 supports an appropriate mix of tourism, leisure and housing uses. We therefore suggest that the policy be expanded to include wider uses. These uses themselves will generate additional income to enable the vital restoration of these buildings before they crumble still further to the point where they are beyond salvation.</p>	<p>Draft Policy SP08 policy should therefore be expanded and amended to include the following wording:</p> <p>"Proposals for leisure and tourism related uses will be supported at The Lido. Residential development will also be considered acceptable where it can be demonstrated that this is necessary to financially support, and thus enable, the vital restoration of this important heritage asset. Any new development must demonstrate particular care in its design, location, use of materials and relationship to this heritage asset."</p>	1241		Email
Alan Byrne/English Heritage		155			Support	Policy SP08 - Margate -we support this policy that will build upon the improvements that have come about as a result of heritage and cultural-led investment through the MACH programme, the THI and the Turner Contemporary gallery development.		429		Email
Brain	Dayle	401			Object	Allocation Ref No 5411 - allocation of 32 dwellings Cottage Car Park, New Street. I am WHOLLY against this. This is an important car park in the Old Town in Margate where parking is at a premium, and is in constant use.		1276		Email
Causer	Sam	405	Studio Sam Causer		Object	We at Margate Coastal Park Promotion Group would like to see reference in the local plan to Margate Coastal Park, a publicly-owned stretch of landscape running from Botany Bay in the east		1177		Web

						<p>to Old Boundary Road in the west, the entire length of coastline of the borough of Margate.</p> <p>All our research on the growth, development, significance and current state of this public landscape, gathered over several decades by the people of Margate Pro Bono Publico (for the public good) has been publicly shared on our the website here for over two and a half years:  <a href="http://www.samcauser.com/Sam_Causer_Dot_Com/Margate_Coastal_Park_1.html">http://www.samcauser.com/Sam_Causer_Dot_Com/Margate_Coastal_Park_1.html</a></p> <p>I would hope that the local plan team have been able to make use of this research, funded by the government Communities and Culture Network +, via the University of Kent.</p> <p>We are very happy to meet if you have any questions about the nature of this research, or the aims of the promotion group.</p>			
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)		Object	<p>Emergency Planning and Resilience: KCC recommends that this policy refers to resilient design in consideration of its coastal location, climate change, flooding and other natural threats. This should include high quality public realm with consideration of how this can enhance the sense of place as well as providing shelter.</p>		1495	Email
Margate Estates		460	Margate Estates	Zena Foale-Banks - Nexus Planning	Object	<p>Policy SP08 is paramount to the future of Margate, relating specifically to the continued regeneration and development of the town as a contemporary seaside resort.</p> <p><b>Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm</b>  Part 3) of Policy SP08 relates specifically to the area designated as the Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm. We recommend that the wording is amended, as shown in bold below, to ensure that the nature of future development within the Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm remains positive and encourages the creation of a viable year-round seaside resort.</p> <p>Within the seafront area of Margate and the Harbour Arm as indicated on the Policies Map, leisure and tourism uses will be permitted, including retail, where they provide a positive contribution to Margate as a year-round seaside resort, enhance the visual appeal of these areas and protect the seafront character and heritage. Residential development above ground floor will be permitted.</p> <p>Further to our comments relating to Policy SP06, we recommend that the Council identify that there is potential for convenience floorspace within the Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm, outside of designated Primary and Secondary Frontages, that does not directly compete with these frontages. It should be made clear that the retail facility envisaged would be more along the lines of a corner shop than a large supermarket.</p> <p><b>Dreamland</b>  Part 4) of the policy relates specifically to protecting the future of Dreamland. While the policy is important in providing a policy basis for safeguarding the existing facility, we consider that more could be included to ensure the future viability of the facility as</p>		1316	Web

					<p>both an amusement park and as an events facility. For example, we recommend the inclusion of text that encourages Dreamland to become a year-round attraction by promoting development that would support this year-round function, such as a more diverse offer of events spaces. At present, Dreamland has a number of large spaces that are used for events. Given the existing spaces, there is potential for Dreamland to further expand its existing events repertoire including for music events, festivals, weddings and conferences. Being able to host an array of events will contribute to the long term longevity of the facility, and help Dreamland and by association Margate, to become a year-round destination.</p> <p>Opportunity Sites Part 5) of Policy SP08 provides guidance for future development at key opportunity sites within Margate. One such opportunity site is the Arlington site, which, apart from the existing residential tower and associated parking, is largely vacant and under utilised. The Arlington site is currently separated into two parts; the north part of the site includes the existing residential tower and vacant shop units and courtyard below, while the south part incorporates the largely under utilised multi-storey car park. The relevant part of the policy states: There are Opportunity Sites identified on the Policies Map which are considered suitable for mixed use town centre development. The ultimate goal of redevelopment of these sites is regeneration. Residential development will be considered acceptable where this does not conflict with the area based criteria above. The policy mapping indicates the presence of an opportunity site with a 'star'. The star identifying the Arlington opportunity site is positioned in the southern portion of the Arlington site area, and does not provide any clarity about that extent of the area considered to be included within the opportunity site. The Arlington site as a whole presents a unique opportunity to provide a major mixed use town centre development serving Margate and it is considered that both the north and south part of the site should be included within the opportunity site designation. By including both parts of the site within the opportunity site designation, future development proposals will be able to more comprehensively accommodate a mixed use town centre development. As such, the mapping should be updated to make it clear that the opportunity site consists of both the north and south Arlington areas.</p>				
Refoy		205	RNLI	Andy Turner - Adams Hendy	Object	<p>Paragraphs 2.23 – 2.33 The Local Plan is considered unsound as it is neither positively prepared nor effective. It does not acknowledge the need for the relocation of the existing RNLI lifeboat station or consider the</p>	So that the plan fully recognises and positively plans to meet objectively assessed development and	632	Web

				Consulting Ltd	<p>development and infrastructure requirements necessary to enable the continued location of an all-weather lifeboat station in Margate.</p> <p>The current Mersey-class all weather lifeboat has been in service for over 25 years and is nearing the end of its operational life. In 2014 the RNLI commissioned the modern and more capable Shannon-class all weather lifeboat to replace the Mersey-class all weather lifeboat and a phased roll-out across the UK is well underway.</p> <p>As with the current lifeboat, the Shannon-class all weather lifeboat uses a carriage mounted slipway as this is the only viable form of launch in the Margate area due to the depth of the sea. The existing lifeboat station will need to be replaced with a larger facility to accommodate the new Shannon-class all weather lifeboat and relocated to enable the lifeboat to be launched and recovered without obstruction.</p> <p>So that the plan fully recognises and positively plans to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, it is recommended that the following text is inserted after paragraph 2.33:</p> <p>The current RNLI Mersey-class all weather lifeboat has been in service in Margate for over 25 years and is nearing the end of its operational life. In 2014 the RNLI commissioned the modern and more capable Shannon-class all weather lifeboat to replace the Mersey-class all weather lifeboat and a phased roll-out across the UK is well underway. As with the current lifeboat, the Shannon-class all weather lifeboat uses a carriage mounted slipway as this is the only viable form of launch in the Margate area due to the depth of the sea. The RNLI have identified that the existing lifeboat station will need to be replaced with a larger facility to accommodate the new Shannon-class lifeboat and relocated to enable the lifeboat to be launched and recovered without obstruction.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the need for a new lifeboat station in Margate to house the new Shannon-class all weather lifeboat and associated facilities.</p> <p>Following the insertion of the supporting text above, an additional policy should be included to demonstrate the Council's intention to plan positively for infrastructure required in the area, in light of this demonstrable need, a new Policy may potentially read as follows:</p> <p>New Policy SP08A</p> <p>The Council will support proposals for the relocation of the RNLI lifeboat station in Margate to house the new Shannon class all-weather lifeboat where it does not conflict with other policies of this plan, or where it can be demonstrated that there are no more appropriate sites that would be capable of accommodating a lifeboat station given the RNLI's operational requirements.</p>	<p>infrastructure requirements, it is recommended that the following text is inserted after paragraph 2.33:</p> <p>The current RNLI Mersey-class all weather lifeboat has been in service in Margate for over 25 years and is nearing the end of its operational life. In 2014 the RNLI commissioned the modern and more capable Shannon-class all weather lifeboat to replace the Mersey-class all weather lifeboat and a phased roll-out across the UK is well underway. As with the current lifeboat, the Shannon-class all weather lifeboat uses a carriage mounted slipway as this is the only viable form of launch in the Margate area due to the depth of the sea. The RNLI have identified that the existing lifeboat station will need to be replaced with a larger facility to accommodate the new Shannon-class lifeboat and relocated to enable the lifeboat to be launched and recovered without obstruction.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the need for a new lifeboat station in Margate to house the new Shannon-class all weather lifeboat and associated facilities.</p> <p>Following the insertion of the supporting text above, an additional policy should be included to demonstrate the Council's intention to plan positively for infrastructure required in</p>			
--	--	--	--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>the area, in light of this demonstrable need, a new Policy may potentially read as follows:</p> <p>New Policy SP08A</p> <p>The Council will support proposals for the relocation of the RNLI lifeboat station in Margate to house the new Shannon class all-weather lifeboat where it does not conflict with other policies of this plan, or where it can be demonstrated that there are no more appropriate sites that would be capable of accommodating a lifeboat station given the RNLI's operational requirements.</p>			
Refoy		205	RNLI	Andy Turner - Adams Hendy Consulting Ltd	Object	<p>SP08 – Margate</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan is considered unsound as Policy SP08 has not been positively prepared and is neither effective nor justified. The policy does not acknowledge the requirement to relocate the RNLI all-weather lifeboat station and is overly restrictive in the uses that it permits given its demonstrable requirement. Policy SP08 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>The Council will seek to support the continued regeneration and development of Margate as a contemporary seaside resort in line with the following area-based proposals, indicated on the Policies Map.</p> <p>...</p> <p>3) Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm</p> <p>Within the seafront area of Margate and the Harbour Arm as indicated on the Policies Map, leisure and tourism uses will be permitted, including retail, where they enhance the visual appeal of these areas and protect the seafront character and heritage. Residential development above ground floor will be permitted. Development essential for public safety will also be permitted.</p>	<p>Policy SP08 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>The Council will seek to support the continued regeneration and development of Margate as a contemporary seaside resort in line with the following area-based proposals, indicated on the Policies Map.</p> <p>...</p> <p>3) Margate Seafront and Harbour Arm</p> <p>Within the seafront area of Margate and the Harbour Arm as indicated on the Policies Map, leisure and tourism uses will be permitted, including retail, where they enhance the visual appeal of these areas and protect the seafront character and heritage. Residential development above ground floor will be</p>	633		Web

							permitted. Development essential for public safety will also be permitted.			
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council		Object	Margate is receiving too much help, Ramsgate is in need of a big injection of funds. ie port. Dreamland operators are getting control of too much of Margate seafront. The 120 hotel proposed is too large.		264		Web
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council		Object	The Lido needs a big cash injection or demolition. It is a blot on the landscape. If Turner wants to expand, let it become pay to enter.		265		Web
Solly	C	419			Support	<p>Point 1: Parking is a problem with Margate especially when a festival, or bank holiday brings in tourists from outside the area. Some statement on supporting sustainable transport should be made and some form of handling the amount of vehicles that come to Margate at peak times should be considered in transport planning.</p> <p>Point 2: A research paper "Down by the sea: Visual arts, artists and coastal regeneration" by Jonathon Ward (International Journal of Cultural Policy). The paper suggests that more positive interaction by councils and enablers would provide a better outcome. Margates regeneration may not all be economic and could affect the local art scene itself if not implemented correctly. The conclusion of the paper is shown below [see attachments]</p> <p>Point 3: The Arlington house area needs ether to be demolished, or a complete remodel required. It was a poor development which I would doubt would be approved now, and time has not helped it. The old Arlington shopping area needs to have more positive action. There is no statement on this which is not going to press change to this area which is a significant part of marine terrace.</p>	<p>Include the need for the increasing transport requirements including parking for Margate, and promotion of sustainable transport options.</p> <p>More positive action on supporting the local artists in Margate which may require specific planning needs.</p> <p>Policy should be more positive in relation to the Arlington house area and old shopping area.</p>	1202	<a href="#">Solly IJCP.jpg (172 KB)</a>	Email
Stevens	Angela	163			Object	<p>6 The Lido.</p> <p>Comment: The Lido is owned by TDC but has not been maintained, nor marketed for leisure activities. The freehold for sale didn't include the whole site, making it unattractive to perspective buyers. Either sell it all or look after the lido properly. It is a site and sight for sore eyes, being totally neglected, as is TDC's wont with all their assets, it would seem.</p>	See comment above.	592		Web
Sykes	Anthony	31			Object	<p>2.31</p> <p>Arlington should not be used for a supermarket as it is not in keeping with the seafront area. As pointed out in the destination plan we need more accommodation in the form of an hotel in order that visitors to Margate stay instead of being just day trippers.</p>		54		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Object	<p>Policy SP08 – Margate / Policy SP09 – Ramsgate / Policy SP10 – Broadstairs</p> <p>All three of these policies currently contain the same caveat around International and European designated sites:</p> <p>Any development permitted by this policy must not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites either directly or as a result of increased visitor pressure.</p>		1448		Email

					<p>All development must comply with policies relating to the Protection of International and European Designated Sites and associated Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan</p> <p>We welcome this additional level of protection beyond the general protected sites policies but we would advise amending the wording slightly. At present the second sentence only makes reference to the policy protection for International and European sites, however these are all underpinned by nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) which may be notified for different interest features vulnerable to different impacts. We would suggest the following amended wording:</p> <p>Development will only be permitted under this policy where it can be demonstrated that it will not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites through any pathway of impact, including increased visitor pressure. Development proposals must comply with the requirements of SP25, SP26 and GI01.</p>				
Wraight	Kenneth	141	1959	Observation	More disabled parking facilities		360		Web



Ramsgate SP09										
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
Alan Byrne/English Heritage		155			Support	Policy SP09 - Ramsgate - this policy is supported; the Council may wish to acknowledge the Heritage Action Zone partnership with Historic England and others and its potential to help to deliver many of the objectives of the policy.		430		Email
Austin	Patricia	379	Thanet Green Party		Object	It is vital for the future of the Isle that we prioritise the health of our residents and the safety of our visitors – but several aspects of the Draft Plan are worrying in this regard. We are also concerned about the environmental impact of the Bretts site on Ramsgate Port, which we understand has not been subject to a full Environmental Impact Assessment, and are very worried about the implications in the Draft Plan that further development of this type is planned. In the light of the Port's proximity both to housing and to the SSSI at Pegwell, we do not believe any further such development should be permitted until full evidence that there will be no negative impact can be provided to residents.		1119		Web
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)		Object	Minerals and Waste: KCC notes the reference to the safeguarding of the Ramsgate Port wharf within para 2.42 in that; 'the growth of the Port of Ramsgate is supported as a source of employment and as an attractor of inward investment' and 'the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan proposes to safeguard the port for the importation of minerals into Kent'. KCC, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, welcomes the inclusion of the reference to the Ramsgate Port in the Local Plan, which is safeguarded under the Safeguarded Wharves and Rail Transportation Adopted Policies Maps of Policy CSM 6: Safeguarded Wharves and Rail Depots of the adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (KMWLP), along with Policy CSM 7: Safeguarding Other Mineral Plant Infrastructure. It should be noted that Policy CSM 6 of the KMWLP outlines the importance of safeguarding mineral transportation facilities to enable the ongoing supply of essential minerals as identified in national planning policy, and non-minerals development, particularly within 250m of the safeguarded minerals transportation facilities, must not unacceptably adversely affect the operation of existing, planning or potential sites, such that their capacity or viability for minerals transportation purposes may be compromised. Moreover, the safeguarded Brett Aggregates (UK) Ltd concrete production facility, which is located on the operational land of the Ramsgate Port wharf, is safeguarded under Policy CSM 7: Safeguarding Other Mineral Plant Infrastructure of the adopted KMWLP. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority recommends that this is acknowledged in the Plan to be in		1496		Email

						accordance with the adopted KMWLP and to ensure that the ongoing lawful operation of the mineral infrastructure is not compromised. KCC notes that the Draft Local Plan does not acknowledge the safeguarded status of the mineral importation facility at Ramsgate Port wharf. KCC recommends that this policy is revised to also include reference to mineral safeguarding and ensure compliance with KMWLP Policies CSM6 and CSM7.			
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)		Object	Emergency Planning and Resilience: KCC recommends that this policy refers to resilient design in consideration of Thanet's coastal location, climate change, flooding and other natural threats. This should include high quality public realm with consideration of how this can enhance the sense of place as well as providing shelter.		1497	Email
Diack	Anne	159			Support	In addition Ramsgate has the potential to further market itself: - from the tourism point of view as a place where, along with heritage, visitors can enjoy a rich and varied food experience. The Addington Street Revival Fair illustrates what can happen once a year. Encouraging and marketing similar events more widely can help to raise the profile of Ramsgate's distinct brand. - from the employment angle. A targeted approach to the Shoreditch area of London to relocate some of their artist's working studios, and digital start-ups to some of the empty shops in Ramsgate at a low rent in return for offering some support for young people might pay off in terms of bringing more people in who can support the local economy. Similarly, promoting Ramsgate as an area where digital media can be developed, while offering a very attractive location/views away from a darkened artificial environment to special effects firms in the Soho area of London where rents are extremely high might also reap benefits. With fast access to London, Ramsgate has the potential to develop a silicon hub. - from the branding and presentation angle. By actively promoting Ramsgate as a location for TV and film with a remarkable and varied range of locations and scenery within a small area that would be very cost effective for location shoots, there is the opportunity to promote Ramsgate as tourist destination through TV and film more widely.		438	Web
Gardiner-Hill		138			Support	I support the plans to enhance Ramsgate town centre through maritime heritage, tourism and café culture, but must point out that the DCO and cargo hub plans for Manston are a direct threat to the economic improvement of Ramsgate town centre as a visitor attraction.		344	Web
Hartley	Tricia	510	Ramsgate Town Team		Observation	Historical features: We would like to see the Plan recognise the huge number of sites of historical interest in Ramsgate. (For the recent Heritage Open Days, for example, by far the most places open in Thanet were in Ramsgate.) We believe the Local Plan should: Focus on Ramsgate as a tourist destination for its historical as		1437	Web

					<p>well as its coastal interest, in conjunction with community groups and Historic England. Ramsgate's HAZ should be highlighted, along with TDC's plans to work with HE &amp; the community to preserve, enhance &amp; make the most of Ramsgate's historical assets.</p> <p>Commit to rigorous use of TDC's enforcement powers to ensure that buildings in the Conservation Area are properly maintained. (The reference to the dilapidated buildings in the town centre is galling when residents depend on TDC to enforce building maintenance and this does not happen.)</p> <p>Commit to ensuring that, where sites of historical interest are earmarked for housing or other new uses, frontages and as many original features as possible are preserved to maintain the streetscape (eg the old Gas Works, Police Station and Fire Station.)</p> <p>Royal Harbour: The Royal Harbour is the jewel in the crown of Ramsgate and attention in the Plan should be given to making the most of its potential.</p> <p>Traffic management: We appreciate that this may not be a Local Plan issue but current arrangements, particularly on Harbour Parade, dramatically limit the Harbour's potential. TDC's insistence on maintaining a dozen roadside parking spaces on Harbour Parade cuts across attempts to develop the café culture the Plan mentions, and results in overcrowded, dangerous pavements, forcing wheelchair users and buggy pushers to take their chances on the road amongst the traffic. (To use a hackneyed phrase, this street is an accident waiting to happen.) A widened pavement with no on-street parking, single-file traffic with passing bays and deliveries permitted at specified times would allow vehicular access to the marina, Brasserie and parking by the Clock House and support the development of the café culture.</p> <p>Town Square: We wonder what happened to the Town Square concept for the Clock House area? With the successful new Wetherspoons development at the Victoria Pavilion bringing many more visitors to the area, it may be timely for this to be reconsidered within the Plan.</p> <p>We remain concerned at the destruction of the historic slipway to make room for a new development which has in fact not happened. This and TDC's unpardonable sale of our seafront to land bankers make it extremely difficult for Ramsgate to make the most of its natural assets. The very least TDC should be doing is using its resources to address this.</p> <p>Ramsgate Port: We believe there is a need for a thorough re-examination of Ramsgate port, its current operation and future potential, and believe that radical, imaginative new ideas for its development should be considered.</p> <p>Ramsgate residents remain seriously concerned about the</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>environmental impact of the Bretts site, both on human health and on the SSSI at Pegwell. We believe a full Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out and its results publicised.</p> <p>We are concerned at the Plan's implication that further industrial-style development on the Port is under consideration and believe no such development should be considered until residents can be provided with evidence that the existing site is entirely safe.</p> <p>Arts: The arts merit only a brief mention in the Ramsgate section of the Plan as it stands.</p> <p>We believe the plan should highlight the large numbers of artists here and the potential to use this to attract more visitors via open studios, exhibition spaces etc, as well as to regenerate the town's economy.</p> <p>The need for arts facilities in the town, both for professional artists and to engage amateurs and young people, is acute and should be stressed in the Plan.</p> <p>Amenities:</p> <p>Café and toilet facilities are urgently needed on the Eastern and Western undercliffs in Ramsgate to cater for increasing number of visitors to these beaches, particularly young families, cyclists and walkers. (We are badged as a cycling- and walking-friendly town, but the absence of such basic facilities is not in practice very welcoming!)</p> <p>The closure of the previous Western Undercliff facilities is a grave loss for the town, and we remain puzzled as to why it has not been possible to replace these via insurance payments or compensation from Southern Water for the flood damage they caused.</p> <p>The possibility of a beach club on the old swimming pool site on the Eastern Undercliff, now a little-used car park currently occupied by travellers, should be given serious consideration.</p> <p>Town centre:</p> <p>The current pedestrianised areas in Ramsgate town centre work well; driving and parking restrictions must, however, be enforced. We have been waiting for some time for a rising bollard at the harbour end of Harbour Street, and hope this will be introduced very soon.</p> <p>To promote public safety we would also suggest the introduction of 20 mph zones in non-pedestrianised roads in the town centre, which are often narrow and potentially dangerous.</p>				
Jones-Hall	Samara	295		Observation	<p>I support the Council's decision to maximise our maritime heritage. However, this is at odds with the unwarranted positive public support given by TDC and Craig MacKinlay for RSP's DCO for Manston.</p> <p>As such, I strongly believe TDC and Craig MacKinlay have been both irresponsible and negligent in its duties in refusing to allocate a specific purpose for the Manston site and by supporting a purpose that will have a significant and severe impact upon Ramsgate's ability to achieve all if not any of Policy SP09 -</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.	877		Web

					<p>Ramsgate.</p> <p>RSP's Proposal omits loss or harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, from physical works or indirectly, e.g. through surface transport or over-head flights. These include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ramsgate has the only Royal Harbour in the UK (1821);</li> <li>- Ramsgate has its own Meridian Mean Time is 5 minutes 41 seconds ahead of Greenwich Mean Time;</li> <li>- Ramsgate Maritime Museum is in the Clock House on the quayside in Royal Harbour, where the Ramsgate Meridian is situated;</li> <li>- Four Gold Anchor Award complex marina is situated in the Royal Harbour;</li> <li>- Shrine of St Augustine;</li> <li>- Ramsgate Montefiore Synagogue &amp; Mausoleum are designated by Jewish Heritage UK as one of the Top Ten Synagogues of Britain;</li> <li>- Royal Temple Yacht Club (1857) and the title Royal was confirmed in 1897;</li> <li>- Sailors' Church and Harbour Mission (1878);</li> <li>- Royal Victorian Pavilion;</li> <li>- Around 900 listed buildings of which five are Grade I and eleven are Grade II and 400 are residential;</li> <li>- Ramsgate is second only to London for its Georgian and Victorian buildings and only to Bath for its Regency architecture;</li> <li>- Home to the Grange the first so-called 'modern' house, built by architect Augustus Pugin, who designed the interiors of the House of Parliament;</li> <li>- Ramsgate Tunnels (the UK's largest network of Civilian Wartime tunnels);</li> <li>- Ramsgate's Royal Esplanade is a conservation zone and the buildings, including the croquet clubhouse, are Grade II listed;</li> <li>- Wellington Crescent Lift is Edwardian and over 100 years old and currently a working cliff lift in Ramsgate;</li> <li>- Awarded the first Heritage Action Zone in 2017 by Historic England;</li> <li>- Ramsgate's history can be traced back to 449 AD and includes landings by Anglo-Saxons, Romans and Saints;</li> <li>- Ramsgate has a rich history of Literary, Architecture and Art heroes.</li> </ul> <p>St Augustine (the first Archbishop of Canterbury) landed nearby to bring Christianity to England. St Laurence-In-Thanet Church (St Laurence-In-Thanet Church) churchyard extends to three and a half acres and contains over 1400 graves dating back as far as 1656. Ramsgate was an important garrison town in the Napoleonic Wars and in 1821 around 40,000 men were landed here. Ramsgate rallied behind the war effort when it became a main point of departure for the "Little Ships" that crossed to Dunkirk to rescue Allied troops.</p> <p>Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Arthur Ransome, Wilkie Collins, Vincent Van Gogh, Sir Francis Cowley Burnand, James Tissot, Stanislaw</p>	<p>This is line with Objective 2 of the Department for Environment: Food and Rural Affairs single 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, E06</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</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					<p>de Karłowska, Anthony Buckeridge, Elizabeth Fry, Hans Christian Anderson, Daniel Defoe and Jane Austen, whose brother lived in the town. Charles Dickens also performed on stage in the Town. Karl Marx and his daughter lived here. Charles Darwin stayed here, and the World's Greatest Showmen, Buffalo Bill and PT Barnum, both brought their circus shows to town. The latter also brought General Tom Thumb. James Tissott painted 15 paintings of Ramsgate. Joseph Mallord Turner painted Ramsgate's Royal Harbour. Vincent Van Gough inked a View of Royal Road Ramsgate whilst working as an assistant schoolmaster here in Ramsgate. Augustus Pugin is regarded as being one of Britain's most influential architects and designers designed many of the buildings around Ramsgate.</p> <p>William Powell Frith's 'Ramsgate Sands' proved a great success with the public. Its reception at the Royal Academy in 1854 was so enthusiastic that a guard-rail was installed to protect it from the crowds keen to examine the details at close hand. Queen Victoria expressed an interest in buying it. Queen Victoria had visited Ramsgate several times with her mother between 1825 and 1836 and had stayed in Albion House (now a successful boutique hotel since the airport has closed), visible in Frith's composition as the highest building overlooking the beach. Many of Ramsgate seafront remains the same and is visible in Frith's painting.</p> <p>Landscape and Tranquility:  Ramsgate's historic landscapes would be directly affected by the start of over-flight (day and night) and more indirectly by increased road traffic.</p> <p>Noise from aircraft and air pollution would be intrusive and have a detrimental impact on the appreciation, understanding and enjoyment on the extensive designated and undesignated historic and heritage sites.</p> <p>Historic landscapes – The Royal Harbour, Ramsgate Conservation areas and all areas mentioned above – are a key part of the historic character and heritage of Ramsgate and the tranquility of the historic areas (the Royal Harbour and Conservation Areas) are valued by residents and visitors.</p> <p>There will be a detrimental visual impact on the views from and towards the historic Royal Harbor, which since the closure of the previously failed airport has a steadily growing café culture and independent shops around the Royal Harbour and inside the refurbished Military Road Arches.</p> <p>RSP's Proposal not only threatens the character of these historical places but the literary, artistic and architectural settings of our heritage which will diminish enjoyment and understanding as well as slow or reverse visitor numbers and tourism spend in the coastal economy in Ramsgate and Thanet.</p> <p>Preserving the tranquility of all these areas including the Ramsgate main sands is not only important for the people that live in these coastal communities but it is also important for the tourism economy and is part of our national heritage and integral</p>	<p>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 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 back winning strategy/proven success by investing in Heritage, Arts, Culture and Active Lifestyle related Tourism.</p> <p>Further it will destroy and diminish Thanet's landscape character and local distinctiveness.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

						to our history.				
Jones-Hall	Jason	228			Observation	<p>Whilst I broadly welcome the proposals - and in particular the focus on maximising Ramsgate's "maritime heritage, Royal Harbour, marina, beach and attractive waterfront, and provide economic base of its vibrant mix of town centre uses, visitor economy and café culture" - it is impossible to see how this is consistent with TDC's inexplicable decision to reserve the Manston Airport site for airport use rather than approving the site for mixed development.</p> <p>It is absolutely inconceivable that the growth and positive developments of Ramsgate, the excellent Royal Harbour and the prosperous "cafe culture" developing around it could continue with noisy and low-flying cargo planes flying over the harbour, as would be the case under RSP's proposals. There is no part of loud aircraft drowning out conversations and disturbing the otherwise beautiful vistas and overall ambience of the harbour that says "cafe culture" or does anything but destroy any possibility of continued development and growth of these spaces and businesses.</p> <p>As both a private individual and business owner in Ramsgate. A major part of my business is focused on placemaking, including economic regeneration based on the built environment and unique features of local heritage, culture and architecture. This includes my current involvement as a contracted partner in the Pioneering Places project for Ramsgate, funded through Arts Council, Heritage Lottery Fund and Historic England's Great Place Scheme. I cannot see how this initiative or others like it can possibly continue to make their positive contributions to the growth, development and regeneration of Ramsgate if continued activity is under threat from the proposed development of Manston Airport.</p>	If this policy is to be fully implemented and given the best chance of success, the threat of the Manston Cargo Hub must be taken off the table.	910		Web
Koch	Linda	128			Observation	Points 2.34, 2.35,2.36 are incompatible with the presence of a cargo hub at Manston. Noisy airplanes overhead will put a stop to any café culture around the harbour area and will have a negative impact on cultural creativity, nor will Ramsgate be able to "attract more economically active residents".		286		Web
Latchford	Barry	45			Observation	Regarding the Port, item 4, proposals are too airy fairy without any real substance. It is losing £2m each year and still the council prevaricates with a lot of maybes and hopefulls. It is well beyond time that the council took a mature and responsible approach and the first step should be the a comprehensive study and report by a viable independent company. Such a report is a vital first step to stemming the haemorrhaging of much needed public funds.	It is very important that a study be commissioned from an independent company on practical ways of stopping the haemorrhaging of public funds (at present £2 per year loss) and the possibilities available to turn the port into a profitable enterprising unit that would fit in with the true character of Ramsgate and it's tourist and leisure amenities. For	106		Web

							industrial ports we already have Dover.			
May	Raymond	238			Observation	The Council seeks to develop its maritime heritage, around the Royal Harbour, its leisure role and obvious tourist attractions. This aim is at odds with the Council's intention to support a future role for aviation at Manston. The areas in question are directly under the Eastern Approach runway. The freight hub envisaged by RSP would result in very frequent overflying of the tourist areas both day and night, resulting in a major reduction in revenues of those businesses supporting the tourism and leisure.		735		Web
McCulloch	Andrew	44			Support	The Plan states that "Any such proposals should have regard to the emerging Ramsgate Maritime Plan or any subsequent plan adopted by the Council." It should go further and state that no proposals will be considered until after the adoption of the Maritime Plan. It is impossible to comply with proposals when you don't know what they are. The Council is still labouring under the mistaken belief that there is a long term viable future for ferry operations out of the commercial port. It is high time that a more imaginative approach was taken here since to date this cloud cuckoo land wishful thinking has only led to net losses of £7224 per day. In general I agree with the proposals but the wording is too vague and leaves the Planning Committee open to legal challenge by developers		99		Web
McNamara	Francis & Yvonne	183			Object	With reference to retail development being kept to central high street, we agree, providing it ends at Argos with the remaining part of the high street leading to Park Road taken for residential use, as we feel the high street is too long and has become very run down. Queen Street has been upgraded considerably with a mix of commercial and residential and is looking better except for the Queens House building which is looking dilapidated and should be residential rather than office space. King Street is a lost cause for businesses and should be residential. Iceland should be moved into the high street with other larger well known retailers for everyday shopping for residents therefore keeping them all in a confined pedestrianised area and leading to less empty shops/buildings. Harbour Street and York Street should be promoting Ramsgate with independent retailers combining a mix of tourist and quirkier shops with cafes, tea-rooms and bakeries. Argyle House, which could do with a makeover, should be for main office spaces. The proposals for The Royal Harbour and waterfront are fine, but has the potential to be larger. We note that the council make no mention in the local plan for the former Pleasurrama site, which has laid empty and derelict for over 20 years and is an eyesore on Ramsgate Main Sands. We feel the site should be used for promoting tourism and complement the Ramsgate Tunnels which has become a successful tourist and educational attraction for Ramsgate's wartime history. The council have lacked vision for Ramsgate ignoring it's potential for tourism and focusing far too much on	We feel the best use for the Port is to allow the Royal Harbour to expand into the Port so that it can take larger cruisers and yachts and to look for private enterprise to turn it into a marine village focusing on marine life and leisure facilities creating educational and employment opportunities. The Port for commercial operations is a lost cause and too much time and money has been wasted on it.	790		Web



						<p>Margate, therefore neglecting these sites including West Cliff Hall and the Maritime Museum (which has it's own timeline, the only one in the country apart from Greenwich).</p> <p>We do not agree with the council's proposals for Ramsgate Port in the local plan. The Port has never been successful and it's cost the ratepayer millions of pounds in losses and debts. The Port of Ramsgate is too close to The Port of Dover, which is strategically better placed for motorway access. Dover is expanding it's port and and always has undercut passenger and cargo ferry services in Ramsgate.</p>			
N		257			Object	<p>With the current threat of a cargo hub, along with the imposing works by Bretts, Ramsgate's marine feel is seriously under threat. The two ideas of safeguarding the seafront feel and industrialising the port right next to the marine area is not viable. Due diligence needs to be fully undertaken with any ferry company that TDC show interest in too. I do not believe that it has been done so for the current offer. This really is outrageous, after the TransEuropa debacle.</p>		903	Web
Pidduck	John	17			Observation	<p>The main advantage for Ramsgate is the Harbour and seafront. To maintain and encourage visitors to the Harbour Parade and Military Road areas must be to to make them pedestrian only, especially at weekends in the summer. There is nothing worse than sitting at one of the cafe's looking at parked and passing cars when we have the heritage and beauty of the Royal Harbour blocked from view. The footpaths are too narrow and dangerous when the road is being used. More use should be made of the Ramsgate Tunnel for parking on the Western Undercliff. The Eastern Undercliff Car park should be used more, and the Western Esplanade. Business deliveries should be restricted to before 9am.</p>		28	Web
Ransom	Natasha	190	British Horse Society		Observation	<p>The beach by the Western Undercliff is popular with horse riders.</p>		572	Web
Read	Chris	344	South Thanet Constituency Labour Party		Object	<p>The latest draft of the local plan contains the following brief section on the Port of Ramsgate.</p> <p>4) Ramsgate Port</p> <p>The Council supports further development at Ramsgate Port which would facilitate its improvement as a port for shipping, increase traffic through the port, and introduce new routes and complementary land based facilities including marine engineering, subject to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a demonstrable port-related need for any proposed land based facilities to be located in the area of the port, and a demonstrable lack of suitable alternative inland locations; and</li> <li>• compatibility with the character and function of Ramsgate waterfront and the Royal Harbour as a commercial leisure facility; and</li> <li>• an acceptable environmental assessment of the impact of the proposed development upon the harbour, its setting and surrounding property, and the impact of any proposed land reclamation upon nature conservation, conservation of the built environment, the coast and archaeological heritage, together</li> </ul>		1034	Web

					<p>with any proposals to mitigate the impact.</p> <p>Land reclamation will not be permitted beyond the western extremity of the existing limit of reclaimed land.</p> <p>Any development permitted by this policy must not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites either directly or as a result of increased visitor pressure. All development must comply with policies relating to the Protection of International and European Designated Sites and associated Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Ramsgate Action Group, which has been investigating £2m p.a. losses at the port, has provided indicative comments as follows. As it stands, it is anodyne beyond words and avoids two simple but uncomfortable truths.</p> <p>Even the most optimistic proposal for a ferry at the Port of Ramsgate doesn't end the losses (based on current assumptions and fees). At six sailings a day (the current conceivable maximum), a ferry service would only halve the losses on the port, not end them.</p> <p>Similarly, with regards to an 'industrial strategy', if we sub-leased the whole port to Brett's on current terms and current rents, the losses on the port would actually increase substantially.</p> <p>The land should never have been reclaimed in the first place, as is clear from the entire history of the port. In over 40 years, it has never made money and has been a constant and recurrent drain on the resources of TDC, requiring millions of pounds to be written off by the council taxpayers of Thanet.</p> <p>The two alternative options at the moment are: 1) to hand the port, and its financial obligations, back to the Crown Commissioners, who may then ask someone like Dover or Felixstowe to run it on their (our) behalf; 2) to pursue a marina village development with boutique hotel and luxury housing and shops, which is the preferred option of Paul Messenger and Craig Mackinlay and represents privatisation by stealth. 3. Consult with Ramsgate residents to identify what other use might be made of the Port area, ie the UKs first 'green pier'. This would make the Port area an amenity and a benefit for Ramsgate residents and potentially bolster our tourism offering. 4. Efforts should be made to strategically 'link up' the coast both along its length, generating a stronger coastal identity, in common with other coastal areas, Folkestone Leas for instance. Such a plan should also link both residences and business to the coastal area. A cohesive plan of this type would drive economic regeneration. We need to avoid a piecemeal approach and avoid any further devision between town and coast.</p> <p>The Labour Party position must surely be that the port must remain in public hands and run responsibly. There needs to be a full investigation into allegations of corruption and a Labour will secure a full public consultation about the future of the port that does not confine us to the two options outlined above. Any eventual plan should be to the benefit of the majority of people in Thanet and not only those who can afford to use</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					high-end facilities in privatised space.				
Richford	Eileen	509	Ramsgate Town Council	Object	Ramsgate Town Council resolved that its comment on the Draft Local Plan should be; "Greater weight should be given in the Local Plan to provide more art space in Ramsgate. There should be an innovative plan for the redevelopment of the Port" Minute: 089 RTC Planning and Environment Committee held on 12 September 2018.		1436		Email
Sarafoglou	Alex	134		Observation	Re Section 2.41 - the Royal Harbour is a listed structure, yet no mention is made to ensuring its repair and maintenance. This should be a subject of Council policy as the continued operation of the Harbour is dependent upon the Georgian sluices functioning correctly.		336		Web
Sarafoglou	Alex	134		Object	While section 2.42 recognises employment and investment potential arising from the port of Ramsgate through infrastructure and industry, it does not recognise the potential for arising from leisure and tourism. Whilst the current proposed services, including a passenger ferry, might not be economically viable on their own, a feasibility study should be conducted to consider if expanding the remit of the Port to include tourism and leisure may complement existing proposals and enhance the economic viability of the Port. As this section and current proposals from the Council have not considered a feasibility study of this nature, nor conducted a full and detailed review of the economic viability of the Port, I deem this document to be unsound on the basis that reasonable alternatives have not been fully considered, ie the following property that the plan is "justified" not been fulfilled: "justified (the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate evidence base)"	Add leisure and tourism as potential catalysts for economic growth and inward investment in the Port of Ramsgate.	337		Web
Sarafoglou	Alex	134		Object	Section 4 does not recognise the potential for employment arising from leisure and tourism. Whilst the current proposed services, including a passenger ferry, might not be economically viable on their own, a feasibility study should be conducted to consider if expanding the remit of the Port to include tourism and leisure may complement existing proposals and enhance the economic viability of the Port. As this section and current proposals from the Council have not considered a feasibility study of this nature, nor conducted a full and detailed review of the economic viability of the Port, I deem this document to be unsound on the basis that reasonable alternatives have not been fully considered, ie the following property that the plan is "justified" not been fulfilled: "justified (the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate evidence base)" Additionally the section omits the importance of the Port being economically sustainable. Only proposals which have been subject to feasibility study and stringent cost benefit analysis should be considered. This has not historically been the case.	Add leisure and tourism as potential catalysts for economic growth in the Port of Ramsgate, and make explicit that all proposals must contribute to the economic sustainability of the Port.	338		Web

Solly	C	419			Object	<p>Point 1: It has recently come to light that Ramsgate Port has incurred losses for some time. A council petition is currently open (sept 18) and worded "We the undersigned petition the council to accept we have no confidence in the Council's operation of the Royal Harbour and Port. So we demand that Thanet District Council create an independent working party to investigate the losses and bring forward a comprehensive regeneration plan within six months.</p> <p>The council have also suffered financial losses of over 20 million pounds over 8 years on Ramsgate port and viability needs to be tested if this policy is positivity providing economic benefits to Thanet and is effective.</p> <p>News story: <a href="https://theisleofthanetnews.com/ramsgate-port-has-made-losses-of-20million-over-eight-years">https://theisleofthanetnews.com/ramsgate-port-has-made-losses-of-20million-over-eight-years</a></p> <p>Newstory: <a href="https://theisleofthanetnews.com/ramsgate-meeting-passes-vote-of-no-confidence-in-thanet-council-port-and-harbour-management">https://theisleofthanetnews.com/ramsgate-meeting-passes-vote-of-no-confidence-in-thanet-council-port-and-harbour-management</a></p> <p>Point 2: In terms of the port business it is unclear if a duty to cooperate has happened with Dover council in regards to affecting the ports business on both areas. Dover has a large plan to expand the port services and marina which has attracted grant money for development. It is unclear if this has an effect on Ramsgates Port and Marina.</p> <p>Point 3: The site known as "Pleasurama Amusement Park, Marina Esplanade" Application number 03/1200 requires more positive action to regenerate this area of Ramsgate the phasing for this development starts in 2023 until 2027. The original planning permission was obtained in 2003. It is strange that a decision for the airport site has a 2 year window to establish if a DCO is successful or not, however nothing is described for this brownfield site in this policy. The land area is holding back the opportunities in Ramsgate and time should be served on the current strategy. An action plan or CPO powers should be considered to secure the site for development now.</p> <p>Point 4: Ramsgate town centre needs support along with King street and the former Swiss cottage pub which for many decades has required regeneration. The influence of Westwood Cross has not helped no suitable plan has addressed this.</p> <p>Point 5: Parking in Ramsgate is reasonable but unfortunately car parking charges have an effect on the ability for tourists. This should be referenced in the transport policy.</p>	<p>New Council strategy over Ramsgate port/Marina, contain costs of Ramsgate port.</p> <p>Regeneration required in parts of Ramsgate including King Street.</p> <p>New strategy on the former Pleasurama site, this site can be developed now and policy should address this issue. This is pivotal to the future success of Ramsgate, and the main sands.</p>	1204		Email
Stevens	Angela	163			Object	<p>SP09 point 2.</p> <p>2.44 Recognising the proximity of the port to the Sandwich Bay and Thanet Coast SSSIs, SPAs, Ramsar Site, Marine SAC and Thanet Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ), development proposals for growth would be subject to the Habitat Regulations and will need sensitive consideration in relation to nature conservation and landscape.</p> <p>Comment: Why were the above conservation sites not considered before Brett's were allowed on the port? Their</p>	<p>Comply with the following essential tests stated for any future development to see whether Brett's should even be on the Port. These tests should, have been done before Brett's were allowed on the port!</p> <p>2.44 Recognising the</p>	595		Web

						concrete factory blows carcinogenic particles into the air. I live in Pegwell, over a mile away, but get dirty particles of fine grit on my window ledges since Brett's arrived in Port Ramsgate, due to the prevailing winds off the sea. I also have a permanent frog in the back of my throat these days from the dust. Health and safety matters have been ignored and need sorting.	proximity of the port to the Sandwich Bay and Thanet Coast SSSIs, SPAs, Ramsar Site, Marine SAC and Thanet Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ), development proposals for growth would be subject to the Habitat Regulations and will need sensitive consideration in relation to nature conservation and landscape.			
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Object	<p>Policy SP08 – Margate / Policy SP09 – Ramsgate / Policy SP10 – Broadstairs</p> <p>All three of these policies currently contain the same caveat around International and European designated sites: Any development permitted by this policy must not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites either directly or as a result of increased visitor pressure.</p> <p>All development must comply with policies relating to the Protection of International and European Designated Sites and associated Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan We welcome this additional level of protection beyond the general protected sites policies but we would advise amending the wording slightly. At present the second sentence only makes reference to the policy protection for International and European sites, however these are all underpinned by nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) which may be notified for different interest features vulnerable to different impacts. We would suggest the following amended wording: Development will only be permitted under this policy where it can be demonstrated that it will not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites through any pathway of impact, including increased visitor pressure. Development proposals must comply with the requirements of SP25, SP26 and GI01.</p> <p>There is currently a typographical error in SP09 which refers to the 'Thanet MCZ', this should read the 'Thanet Coast MCZ.'</p>		1449		Email
Walker	John	231	The Ramsgate Society		Object	<p>Comments on Chapter 2: Town Centre Strategy; SP09 (Ramsgate) Ramsgate: Royal Harbour, Marina and Port</p> <p>5.1 The Society strongly welcomes the positive support of the Draft Plan to “maintain and improve the vitality, diversity and economic vibrancy of the town centre, secure enhancement of historic buildings, support development of the visitor economy including cultural creativity, attract more economically active residents and strengthen the range of local services” (para 2.36), and the further statement that “leisure and tourism uses will be particularly encouraged around the marina area” (para 2.39).</p> <p>5.2 We agree that the regeneration of Ramsgate “depends on the continued attractiveness of the Royal Harbour” and that it is “a tourism and leisure attraction with significant potential” (para</p>		709		Web

					<p>2.41). It is a gem, and one of the most attractive harbours in England, and it has, with the port, the potential to be further developed and to become a major engine in the future economic growth of Ramsgate and Thanet more generally.</p> <p>5.3 Sadly, the Draft Plan is disappointing and unimaginative in its vision for the harbour, marina and port, particularly the latter. Reference is made at a number of places to the “emerging” Ramsgate Maritime Plan; it has been “emerging” for a number of years and is mainly a statement of what exists, with very little specific vision for the future. The lack of any detailed consideration of the future of the area in the earlier Draft Local Plan (2015) and in the Revisions document (2017) was a glaring omission. The current Draft Plan is only slightly fuller in its consideration of the future development of and prospects for the Royal Harbour, marina and port.</p> <p>5.4 The Draft Plan supports the further growth of the port “as a source of employment and as an attractor of inward investment” (para 2.42) and supports development “which would facilitate (the Port’s) improvement as a port for shipping, increase traffic through the port, and introduce new routes” (SP09.4). There is a brief reference in paragraph 2.42 to the “potential growth of port trade including passenger ferry operations” (our emphasis). There is no recognition, however, that TDC is known to be strongly committed to the reintroduction of a primarily freight-based ferry service between Ramsgate and Ostend, and has been in lengthy negotiation with Seaborne Freight, a newly formed company, to provide this service. Why is this intention to reintroduce a freight ferry service not included in the Plan?</p> <p>5.5 The port of Ramsgate has been losing more than £2million pounds each year (£2.6m in 2017-18) following the collapse of the previous ferry service operated by TransEuropa Ferries in May 2013, when the company went into administration owing TDC £3.4 million in unpaid berthing fees. TDC has decided, in order to improve the financial viability of the port, and despite the evidence of the TransEuropa debacle, to try to restore a ferry service, something which has astonished experts in the marine freight business.</p> <p>5.6 The concerns about a post-Brexit problem at the Port of Dover and the need for “resilience planning” have led some- including Kent County Council- to give more credence to the reintroduction of a Ramsgate ferry service, but such a service could make only a very small difference by comparison with Dover’s capacity, particularly in view of some of the physical limitations on any significant increase in large vessels using the port (for example, the shallow waters offer only single channel access and a restricted turning circle, together with the constant problem of silting and the consequent need for frequent dredging).</p> <p>5.7 We believe that a much better, longer-term solution to the future of the port would be a comprehensive re-development of the port, harbour and marina as an integrated entity, with a</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					<p>mixed use of leisure, tourism (including hotel accommodation), commercial/retail and residential; in short, a “marina village” concept, to be developed over a period of probably 15 years, with a strict planning and design brief. Such a development would transform the financial prospects of the harbour, marina and port area, and provide much greater employment growth than a ferry service.</p> <p>5.8 In the same way that the Plan makes no reference to current thinking, planning and indeed negotiations about a new freight ferry service, it makes no reference to the fact that a company specialising in marinas and marina villages (MDL) has been making presentations to both TDC and Kent County Council, and the proposal for a marina village has been considered by TDC elected members.</p> <p>5.9 Also, in the same way that the two Manston proposals by RSP and SHP should be looked at side by side in order to choose the better option, so the two alternative options for the future of the port- one based on current industrial services and a ferry, the other a mixed use development majoring on leisure and tourism- should be considered on a level playing field, with all options genuinely open. The Leader of TDC, when asked about the discussions with MDL and specifically whether TDC was looking at its proposals seriously, replied that “all options are open” (BBC South East News, 7 September 2018).</p> <p>5.10 A marina village proposal, however attractive as a future vision for the harbour and port area, would need very careful consideration, and MDL itself has indicated that TDC would need to undertake due diligence and a feasibility study before proceeding, but TDC has failed to show seriousness of intent by not funding such a study, as requested by MDL.</p> <p>5.11 The Society strongly disagrees with the sections of the Plan dealing with future activities on the port other than the ferry proposal. In paragraph 2.42 it is stated “The Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-2030 proposes to safeguard the port for the importation of minerals into Kent.” This is incompatible with the development of the marina and port area for leisure and tourism activities (and retail and residential uses if the marina village concept becomes a reality). This and related industrial uses, such as the aggregates and concrete plant run by Brett Aggregates Ltd on a leased site on the port, would need to be relocated to other ports which do not have the increasing leisure and tourism focus of the Royal Harbour and Port of Ramsgate.</p> <p>5.12 It is arguable that it is not the purpose of Local Plans to concern themselves with operational details of delivery or with the funding issues associated with the plans and projects, so specific references to individual ferry and marina companies or statements of intent from Leaders of Councils may have no place in a Draft Plan, but it does seem surprising that the Plan includes no reference to either the planned freight ferry service or the possibility of a marina village. Either or both would give some</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					<p>sense of what kind of specific future TDC is considering and planning for, whereas much of the Plan, including those sections dealing with the future of the marina and port, is full of worthy but vague intentions.</p> <p>Ramsgate Town Centre</p> <p>6.1 In para 5.1 above, the Society welcomed the commitment of the Draft Plan to “maintain and improve the vitality, diversity and economic vibrancy of the town centre”. The Society welcomes many of the detailed points in Chapter 2 on Town Centres, and specifically policy SP09 on Ramsgate town centre. As the Plan states, Ramsgate has been “adversely affected by the decline of the traditional holiday resort” but that there are encouraging signs of recovery and new tourism and leisure developments, including a strong “café culture” around the Royal Harbour area and the Arches.</p> <p>6.2 The Society believes that the Plan, and TDC, need to take the challenge of the “retail revolution” very seriously. There is every danger that the decline in recent years of the High Street, King Street and Harbour Street in particular, mainly due to the competition provided by the Westwood Cross Shopping Centre, will be further exacerbated by the shift away from large stores to internet shopping. The growth in empty and derelict shopfronts acts as a further disincentive to new and alternative uses. The future of the town centre retail space lies primarily in the success (or otherwise) of growth in the leisure and tourism economy.</p> <p>6.3 We believe there is need for an urgent review of measures which can be taken to rejuvenate, and attract new investment into, the area over the next decade and beyond. We are unclear about the evidential base for the assertion that Ramsgate has a need for “an additional 4,537 square metres of retail floor-space”, although the further assertion that it can be “adequately accommodated by the current vacancies” is sadly more credible.</p>				
Warner	Barbara	198	Mrs	Object	The Port is losing over 2 million pounds a year. Even IF a new ferry service were introduced, which, on the evidence, appears would not be viable, the Port would still be running at a huge loss. A Marina village would be far better for the Port and give Ramsgate a new and vibrant feel. Ramsgate deserves better.	Designate the Port land a Marina village.	788		Web
Warner	Chris	291	mr	Object	The current Port losses stand at over £2 million per year, thanks to inactivity by TDC, whose only plan appears to be the reintroduction of a completely unviable ferry operator. As matters stand the site is a wasteland, a shameful eyesore and a criminal waste of valuable development space.	Redevelop the site as a marina village, as has been suggested by a company with a worldwide track-record of success in this area.	858		Web
Yeomans	Alan	28		Object	Please get on and pass the plans for SHP the old local plan without the airport should been passed. Any counsellors elected who have changed party should have stood in a by-election. We did not vote for a Tory administration. Ramsgate is a tourist destination not an industrial town it needs the surfing and swimming pools being offered. Plus we do not need you to dig up good farm land to build on when the airport could take the housing required. As for transport the increase in parking fees		49		Web



						puts people off coming for the day, just go to Joss Bay and look at the empty car park but the road opposite is full. If the charge was a fiver for the day I'm sure it would be full and you would have increased revenue.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Broadstairs SP10																		
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								
Alan Byrne/English Heritage		155			Support	Policy SP10 - Broadstairs - we support this policy in as far as it falls within our remit to preserve and enhance the historic environment.		431		Email								
Bailey	Ruth	65			Object	<p><b>Objective</b> 2.45 Broadstairs is an attractive town with a thriving town centre and is a popular location for visitors and residents who enjoy its heritage, Dickensian past, beaches, local events and picturesque waterfront. Broadstairs has a strong commercial and visitor economy and has been resilient during the economic downturn. It is important to maintain and enhance the town's attractive character and economic base.</p> <p><b>Reality</b> There is a common perception held by residents that Broadstairs suffers from lack of attention and investment from the Local Authority compared to its neighbours, Margate and Ramsgate. The town's communal areas appear neglected and are only kept in check by local volunteer groups litter picking, gardening and painting etc. There are constant complaints, from residents and visitors alike, about the poor condition of the public toilets and their restrictive opening hours, particularly in the winter. There are constant complaints about exorbitant parking charges. The public gardens are becoming more and more neglected. The globe lights and decorative string lights along the promenade have not been working all summer making the area dark, dangerous and unattractive. There has also been a previous problem with litter, a lack of public litter bin collections and street cleaning but, of late, this seems to have improved a little. Considering that Broadstairs relies, and brings in, millions of pounds of tourist money there never seems to be any time or money spent on ongoing maintenance, let alone capital expenditure projects, in Broadstairs.</p> <p>While some community assets have been sold back to the Town Council to manage it is a worry that the fate of the town's main museum is in jeopardy as shown here -</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1231 1556 1967 1829"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Cost of repairs - March 2014</th> <th>Cost of repairs - November 2017</th> <th>Approximate increase in costs in this 3-year period</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dickens House Museum, Broadstairs</td> <td>£153,710</td> <td>£210,450</td> <td>37 per cent</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>"The {museum} requires sophisticated strategies and operations to remain viable - this expertise is outside of the scope of the</p>		Cost of repairs - March 2014	Cost of repairs - November 2017	Approximate increase in costs in this 3-year period	Dickens House Museum, Broadstairs	£153,710	£210,450	37 per cent	<p>The policies are only sound if they are acted on.</p> <p>The importance to our economy of tourism, and the needs of the residents, need to be reflected in investment and positive action not just words. Simply put, care and respect is needed for our shared environment.</p> <p>High parking charges, flaking paintwork, litter, overgrown public gardens etc do nothing to attract the visitors, the economic lifeblood, to our town.</p> <p>The lack of investment and upkeep in our important, historical buildings which are tourist attractions is short sighted and reprehensible.</p>	208		Web
	Cost of repairs - March 2014	Cost of repairs - November 2017	Approximate increase in costs in this 3-year period															
Dickens House Museum, Broadstairs	£153,710	£210,450	37 per cent															

					<p>local authority resources. Without significant investment, it is likely that the premises will be closed in the medium term. This is not a desirable outcome for anyone. The council led review of the museums concluded Thanet Council is no longer able to financially support the museums, and therefore must try to find alternative sustainable futures."</p> <p><a href="https://democracy.thanet.gov.uk/documents/s61337/Museums%20Scrutiny%20Report%201.pdf">https://democracy.thanet.gov.uk/documents/s61337/Museums%20Scrutiny%20Report%201.pdf</a></p> <p>Objective</p> <p>2.46 Broadstairs is a popular shopping destination characterised by small independently owned shops. The town has many independent shops interspersed with cafes, restaurants and drinking establishments that have enabled the town to buck the trend of high vacancy rates. The town has a particular demand for retail premises selling high street style goods (comparison goods).</p> <p>Reality</p> <p>Exorbitant parking charges are deterring visitors and residents from nearby towns from visiting and using the High Street. There are regular, daily comments on social media such as – “Parking is too costly if you can find a free space it’s a long way from town! Residents shop at Westwood Cross instead of in town.” Parking enforcement needs to be more visible, more frequent and more rigorous during peak times and special events.</p> <p><a href="https://www.thanet.gov.uk/info-pages/car-park-charges/">https://www.thanet.gov.uk/info-pages/car-park-charges/</a></p>				
Cooper	Barbara	514	Kent County Council (KCC)	Object	Emergency Planning and Resilience: KCC recommends that this policy refers to resilient design in consideration of Thanet’s coastal location, climate change, flooding and other natural threats. This should include high quality public realm with consideration of how this can enhance the sense of place as well as providing shelter.		1498		Email
Dunn	Danielle	499	Broadstairs & St.Peter's Town Council	Object	Does not refer to SP25 - Protection of the International and European Designated Sites along with the SPA Mitigation Habitat Regulation Assessment.		1394		Email
Lorenzo	Peter	37	The Broadstairs Society	Support	The Society supports this policy subject to the Design Guidelines contained in the Broadstairs and St Peters Neighbourhood Plan		78		Web
McCulloch	Andrew	44		Observation	There is an urgent need to sort out the traffic flow at the bottom of the High Street/Albion Street/York Street. The chicanes at the bottom of the High Street and outside The Chapel in Albion Street are a regular source of problems. Ideally the road system should be one-way, or even better, pedestrianised. TDC should be approaching KCC traffic managers on this matter.		100		Web
Samme	Linda	16	Manston Parish Council	Support	All should be concentrated on the seafront and visitor areas.		266		Web
Solly	C	419		Object	The transport plan affects the people in Broadstairs, no strategy of improving the transport links has been made. Due to the poor placement of Westwood Cross this fundamentally affects the road links to Broadstairs.	Consider a policy to improve transport links to Broadstairs in relation to the traffic network at	1205		Web

						Parking is an issue, and a coach park has been used for development. There appears to be no strategy for transport for when festivals or peak times happen. Broadstairs as an area is swamped with parked cars at this time. This does affect tourism and retail.	Westwood cross. Transport and Parking and mitigation should be considered at festivals and events and peak times.			
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Object	<p>Policy SP08 – Margate / Policy SP09 – Ramsgate / Policy SP10 – Broadstairs</p> <p>All three of these policies currently contain the same caveat around International and European designated sites: Any development permitted by this policy must not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites either directly or as a result of increased visitor pressure.</p> <p>All development must comply with policies relating to the Protection of International and European Designated Sites and associated Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan We welcome this additional level of protection beyond the general protected sites policies but we would advise amending the wording slightly. At present the second sentence only makes reference to the policy protection for International and European sites, however these are all underpinned by nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) which may be notified for different interest features vulnerable to different impacts. We would suggest the following amended wording: Development will only be permitted under this policy where it can be demonstrated that it will not adversely affect any designated nature conservation sites through any pathway of impact, including increased visitor pressure. Development proposals must comply with the requirements of SP25, SP26 and GI01.</p>		1450		Email