

Chapter 9 - Tourism

Tourist Accommodation E07										
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
Davies	Julie	147	CPRE Kent		Object	With respect to point 3:  Given that the undeveloped land is primarily best and most versatile land we suggest that the policy should seek to steer such development away from best and most versatile land.		400		Web
Margate Estates		460	Margate Estates	Zena Foale-Banks - Nexus Planning	Object	Thanet District Council has clearly identified that there is high demand for additional hotel accommodation within the district, and therefore it considered that the existing wording is not explicit in its support of hotels that do not neatly fall within the 'serviced tourist accommodation' or 'self-catering tourist accommodation' (Policy E09) categories.  We consider that wording in the policy should be amended to explicitly support normal hotel development inappropriate locations.		1322		Web
Stevens	Angela	163			Support	Since the closure of many guest houses in Thanet, the area is desperately short of decent hotels. Also, business rates seem too high to sustain small businesses in the town centres.		662		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Support	<b><i>Policy E07 - Serviced Tourist Accommodation</i></b>  Natural England supports the provision of clause 4 to this policy and the recognition that some types of tourist accommodation have the potential for similar recreational pressure impacts on Thanet's designated nature conservation sites as new housing.		1465		Email

Tourist Accommodation E08										
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
Stevens	Angela	163			Support	Yes, much needed to encourage people to stay longer than just a day.		663		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Object	<p><b>Policy E07 - Serviced Tourist Accommodation</b></p> <p>Natural England supports the provision of clause 4 to this policy and the recognition that some types of tourist accommodation have the potential for similar recreational pressure impacts on Thanet's designated nature conservation sites as new housing.</p> <p><b>Policy E08 – Self Catering Tourist Accommodation</b></p> <p>We would urge your authority to caveat this policy with the same final clause as E07 with regards to the potential need to mitigate for recreational pressure impacts on the designated nature conservation sites.</p>		1466		Email

Thanet's Beaches E10										
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
Gregory	Amelia	119	Friends of Cliftonville Coastline		Observation	<b>Your development plans for beaches in Cliftonville are unclear. What sort of development would you allow at Walpole Bay for instance? Palm Bay is designated undeveloped which makes no sense since it currently supports a cafe, a Jet Ski business, and a huge car park. What does this mean for the rest of the beaches on the stretch between the Main Sands and Walpole Bay? If we want to revitalise the heritage and local amenities of the Cliftonville Coastline these beaches need to be given more detailed consideration. We believe there is scope for sympathetic development within the car park area of Palm Bay, at Walpole Bay (in order to support swimmers) and at the Newgate Gap, in order to bring visitors down to the beach through this historic landscape at a half way point along the Cliftonville Coastline.</b>	We need a lot more detail in these documents to support your plans.	249		Web
Jones-Hall	Samara	295			Observation	Ramsgate Main Sands has been identified by the DCO Applicant as being significantly impacted by the 24/7/365 cargo hub.	<p>The Local Plan must support the mixed-use development of the former Manston airport site and allocate a specific purpose for the Manston site with regards to housing requirements and mixed-use development.</p> <p>This is line with Objective 2 of the Department for Environment: Food and Rural Affairs single developmental plan updated 23 May 2018, the National Planning Policy Framework updated July 2018 and its Local Plan policies including but not limited to SP02, SP09, SP12, SP21, SP23, SP34, SP36, E10, E05</p> <p>Commercial aviation is not viable at the Manston site.</p> <p>A 24/7/365 cargo hub will blight tourism, regeneration, economy, heritage, employment growth and health of Thanet residents.</p> <p>Further, the impact of and congestion on road vehicles and HGVs used to transport air-cargo, workers, passengers and fuel</p>	901		Web

						<p>travelling to and from the proposed airport on Kent's road transport infrastructure and the associated carbon, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions, noise and air pollution - on Thanet's and Kent's villages, towns and businesses is unacceptable nor has it been subject to a Health Impact Assessment; and - nor have travel times for all East Kent stroke victims to reach stroke unit in time as the nearest stroke unit is likely to be moved to William Harvey Hospital in Ashford been addressed.</p> <p>Further, it is a brownfield site which could be used to meet a significant proportion of district's housing needs instead the draft Local Plan (endorsed by Thanet District Council but opposed by its officers) has pushed 2500+ houses to be built on Greenfield sites and in areas with little or no additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Further, Official Nomis statistics show that employment in Thanet has grown 13.8% since the closure of Manston Airport. General employment growth in Thanet mirrors 23% jobs growth in Tourism since closure of Manston. We must continue to back winning strategy/proven success by investing in Heritage, Arts, Culture and Active Lifestyle related Tourism. A 24/7/365 cargo hub will blight - slow or reverse - this economic growth and employment growth.</p> <p>Further it will destroy and diminish Thanet's landscape character and local distinctiveness.</p>				
Lorenzo	Peter	37	The Broadstairs		Support	The Society fully supports Policy E10		74		Web

			Society							
Shoul	Matt	107	FOCC - FRIENDS OF CLIFTONVILLE COASTLINE		Object	Development of beaches is inadequately described - there is no 'meat in the bones' of this highly complex & community pertinent issue - detailed considerations expressed in 'suggestions'.	<p>It is of significant concern that the Draft Plan states beaches will be developed, yet fails to explicitly state *which* beaches are protected from aggressive commercial development &amp; which are protected, as the blanket statements about habitat &amp; environmental protections are not made clear &amp; the general public cannot be expected to know to which beaches these unknown protections apply, or whether these protections can be waived if developers offer merger contributions to modest local causes, for example.</p> <p>Explicit guarantees, with legal ramifications if broken, must be made public domain/common knowledge &amp; how these protections relate to each named beach - otherwise the public &amp; our communities cannot be genuinely aware of what is, or isn't at risk of over development, or development which may compromise the nature of our neighbourhoods &amp; our greatest resource: the sea &amp; its beaches!</p> <p>Not all beach development is inherently positive &amp;/or healthy, or appropriate *regeneration*, and may not genuinely serve the community or community interests, particularly where no on-site/underground car parking is a contractual obligation of a planning proposal - this ought to be mandatory for all developments, which by their very nature bring significant numbers of people into a residential area - hotels with zero on-site parking ought to be automatically banned from planning consent.</p>	258		Web

						<p>It is imperative that the Draft Plan explicitly states what each beach's development would entail - beach side public toilets, restaurants, small local business opportunities etc. - without which the term 'beach development' is essentially meaningless, without personal research into the types of protections in place &amp; whether or not they apply to any given beach.</p> <p>All beaches must be listed &amp; the types of development made clear - otherwise this area of the Draft Plan is inadequately detailed to have proper meaning to the general public, who must be kept well informed about the opportunities &amp; the risks of local beach development.</p>			
Shoul	Matt	402		Object	<p>It is of significant concern that the Draft Plan states beaches will be developed, yet fails to explicitly state *which* beaches are protected from aggressive commercial development &amp; which are protected, as the blanket statements about habitat &amp; environmental protections are not made clear &amp; the general public cannot be expected to know to which beaches these unknown protections apply, or whether these protections can be waived if developers offer merger contributions to modest local causes, for example.</p> <p>Explicit guarantees, with legal ramifications if broken, must be made public domain/common knowledge &amp; how these protections relate to each named beach - otherwise the public &amp; our communities cannot be genuinely aware of what is, or isn't at risk of over development, or development which may compromise the nature of our neighbourhoods &amp; our greatest resource: the sea &amp; its beaches!</p> <p>Not all beach development is inherently positive &amp;/or healthy, or appropriate *regeneration*, and may not genuinely serve the community or community interests, particularly where no on-site/underground car parking is a contractual obligation of a planning proposal - this ought to be mandatory for all developments, which by their very nature bring significant numbers of people into a residential area - hotels with zero on-site parking ought to be automatically banned from planning consent.</p> <p>It is imperative that the Draft Plan explicitly states what each beach's development would entail - beach side public toilets, restaurants, small local business opportunities etc. - without which the term 'beach development' is essentially meaningless, without personal research into the types of protections in place &amp; whether or not they apply to any given</p>		1170		Email

					beach. All beaches must be listed & the types of development made clear - otherwise this area of the Draft Plan is inadequately detailed to have proper meaning to the general public, who must be kept well informed about the opportunities & the risks of local beach development.				
Stevens	Angela	163			Support Free parking would attract more people to the area. The new charges are exorbitant and hardly compatible with getting visitors to return. In fact comments have been made by several residents on Facebook that they've heard visitors saying they will never come back if that's what they've got to pay for parking! False economy, TDC. Free or low parking = more visitors spending money in our coastal towns.		676		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England		Object <b>Thanet's Beaches</b> Natural England supports the final caveat in Policies E10 to E12 making it clear that any development on Thanet's beaches will be subject to the Habitats Regulations. However, we would suggest amending the wording slightly to "Development proposals must <i>avoid or</i> fully mitigate against any impact upon the designated nature conservation sites" as this would better reflect the avoid, mitigate compensate hierarchy as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF.		1467		Email
Wellbrook	Jacqui	20			Support Viking Bay and the centre of Broadstairs - major tourist attraction bringing huge amounts to the economy. Why do we offer disgraceful public toilet facilities on the beach and surrounds? Yes, I know that there is no legal requirement to provide toilets for visitors but the fact remains that visitors want these facilities, paid or otherwise and judge us on this. Some creative thinking, public/private/ voluntary partnership is urgently needed on this		35		Web

Thanet's Beaches E11										
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
Gregory	Amelia	119	Friends of Cliftonville Coastline		Observation	<b>Your development plans for beaches in Cliftonville are unclear. What sort of development would you allow at Walpole Bay for instance? Palm Bay is designated undeveloped which makes no sense since it currently supports a cafe, a Jet Ski business, and a huge car park. What does this mean for the rest of the beaches on the stretch between the Main Sands and Walpole Bay? If we want to revitalise the heritage and local amenities of the Cliftonville Coastline these beaches need to be given more detailed consideration. We believe there is scope for sympathetic development within the car park area of Palm Bay, at Walpole Bay (in order to support swimmers) and at the Newgate Gap, in order to bring visitors down to the beach through this historic landscape at a half way point along the Cliftonville Coastline.</b>	We need a lot more detail in these documents to support your plans.	250		Web
Lorenzo	Peter	37	The Broadstairs Society		Support	The Society supports this policy		75		Web
Shoul	Matt	402			Object	<p>It is of significant concern that the Draft Plan states beaches will be developed, yet fails to explicitly state *which* beaches are protected from aggressive commercial development &amp; which are protected, as the blanket statements about habitat &amp; environmental protections are not made clear &amp; the general public cannot be expected to know to which beaches these unknown protections apply, or whether these protections can be waived if developers offer merger contributions to modest local causes, for example.</p> <p>Explicit guarantees, with legal ramifications if broken, must be made public domain/common knowledge &amp; how these protections relate to each named beach - otherwise the public &amp; our communities cannot be genuinely aware of what is, or isn't at risk of over development, or development which may compromise the nature of our neighbourhoods &amp; our greatest resource: the sea &amp; its beaches!</p> <p>Not all beach development is inherently positive &amp;/or healthy, or appropriate *regeneration*, and may not genuinely serve the community or community interests, particularly where no on-site/underground car parking is a contractual obligation of a planning proposal - this ought to be mandatory for all developments, which by their very nature bring significant numbers of people into a residential area - hotels with zero on-site parking ought to be automatically banned from planning consent.</p> <p>It is imperative that the Draft Plan explicitly states what each beach's development would entail - beach side public toilets, restaurants, small local business opportunities etc. - without which the term 'beach development' is essentially meaningless, without personal research into</p>		1171		Email



					<p>the types of protections in place &amp; whether or not they apply to any given beach.</p> <p>All beaches must be listed &amp; the types of development made clear - otherwise this area of the Draft Plan is inadequately detailed to have proper meaning to the general public, who must be kept well informed about the opportunities &amp; the risks of local beach development.</p>				
Sitch	Sue	38	Mr	Object	<p>We need none of the above to either MINNIS BAY or WESTGATE. We do not want these naturally beautiful bays destroyed by increased population. The beaches currently handle a large number of holiday makers, any more would only add to the pollution of what are currently Blue Flag beaches. The diversity of birds and other wild life would be lost for the sake of ice creams, burgers and chips etc. Is this not wrong in the way our current environment is going.</p>	<p>Protect our beaches, wildlife, local environment. REDUCE BY AT LEAST 50%. Build on Brown fill sites not on prime land. What will be next. This whole plan seems to be only lining the pockets of developers etc to the detriments of the local people. No consideration.</p>	190		Web
Solly	C	419		Object	<p>Point 1: Accessibility to these beaches should be considered as part of the transport plan. Due to the popularity of these beaches, there needs to be a better way to park and reach these areas under sustainable transport options. Over-parking occurs in these areas and some form of traffic management should be used. This does have a negative effect to the residents and communities who reside in the area.</p> <p>Point 2: Sewage disposal should be considered as there has been untreated sewage due to high rainfall demands locally which saturate the treatment works at palm bay. Planning should ensure that the beaches are safe to humans and also protected to ensure water quality equate to blue flag beach standards.</p>	<p>Transport options and parking should be considered under this policy. Policy should safeguard on historical sewage issues following large rainfall.</p>	1246		Email
Stevens	Angela	163		Observation	<p>Parking charges are way too high to attract repeat visits. Bad business! They need to be free or virtually free to get people back!</p>	<p>Reduce all Thanet's parking fees drastically!</p>	677		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England	Object	<p><b>Thanet's Beaches</b></p> <p>Natural England supports the final caveat in Policies E10 to E12 making it clear that any development on Thanet's beaches will be subject to the Habitats Regulations. However, we would suggest amending the wording slightly to "Development proposals must <i>avoid or</i> fully mitigate against any impact upon the designated nature conservation sites" as this would better reflect the avoid, mitigate compensate hierarchy as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF.</p>		1468		Email

Thanet's Beaches E12										
Respondent Surname	Respondent First Name	Respondent number in this document	Respondent Organisation Name	Agent Name	What is the nature of this representation?	Comment	What changes do you suggest to make the document legally compliant or sound?	Comment ID	Attached documents	Submission Method
Environment Agency		449			Support	Policy E12 - Undeveloped Beaches We support the objectives of this Policy We also encourage the Council to continue supporting the work of the Thanet Coast Project and the Sandwich and Pegwell Bay NNR Management Steering Group so that, if development is permitted, the work of these groups can help ensure that proposals fully mitigate against any impact upon the designated nature conservation sites.		1292		Email
Gregory	Amelia	119	Friends of Cliftonville Coastline		Observation	<b>Your development plans for beaches in Cliftonville are unclear. What sort of development would you allow at Walpole Bay for instance? Palm Bay is designated undeveloped which makes no sense since it currently supports a cafe, a Jet Ski business, and a huge car park. What does this mean for the rest of the beaches on the stretch between the Main Sands and Walpole Bay? If we want to revitalise the heritage and local amenities of the Cliftonville Coastline these beaches need to be given more detailed consideration. We believe there is scope for sympathetic development within the car park area of Palm Bay, at Walpole Bay (in order to support swimmers) and at the Newgate Gap, in order to bring visitors down to the beach through this historic landscape at a half way point along the Cliftonville Coastline.</b>	We need a lot more detail in these documents to support your plans.	251		Web
Hudson	Pam	240	Mrs		Observation	Your development plans for beaches in Cliftonville are unclear. What sort of development would you allow at Walpole Bay for instance? Palm Bay is designated undeveloped which makes no sense since it currently supports a cafe, a Jet Ski business, and a huge car park. What does this mean for the rest of the beaches on the stretch between the Main Sands and Walpole Bay? If we want to revitalise the heritage and local amenities of the Cliftonville Coastline these beaches need to be given more detailed consideration. We believe there is scope for sympathetic development within the car park area of Palm Bay, at Walpole Bay (in order to support swimmers) and at the Newgate Gap, in order to bring visitors down to the beach through this historic landscape at a half way point along the Cliftonville Coastline.  We need a lot more detail in these documents to support your plans.		729		Web
Lorenzo	Peter	37	The Broadstairs Society		Support	The Society supports this policy		76		Web
Shoul	Matt	402			Object	It is of significant concern that the Draft Plan states beaches will be developed, yet fails to explicitly state *which* beeches are protected from aggressive commercial development & which are protected, as the blanket statements about habitat & environmental protections are not made clear & the general public cannot be expected to know to which		1174		Email

					<p>beaches these unknown protections apply, or whether these protections can be waived if developers offer merger contributions to modest local causes, for example.</p> <p>Explicit guarantees, with legal ramifications if broken, must be made public domain/common knowledge &amp; how these protections relate to each named beach - otherwise the public &amp; our communities cannot be genuinely aware of what is, or isn't at risk of over development, or development which may compromise the nature of our neighbourhoods &amp; our greatest resource: the sea &amp; its beaches!</p> <p>Not all beach development is inherently positive &amp;/or healthy, or appropriate *regeneration*, and may not genuinely serve the community or community interests, particularly where no on-site/underground car parking is a contractual obligation of a planning proposal - this ought to be mandatory for all developments, which by their very nature bring significant numbers of people into a residential area - hotels with zero on-site parking ought to be automatically banned from planning consent.</p> <p>It is imperative that the Draft Plan explicitly states what each beach's development would entail - beach side public toilets, restaurants, small local business opportunities etc. - without which the term 'beach development' is essentially meaningless, without personal research into the types of protections in place &amp; whether or not they apply to any given beach.</p> <p>All beaches must be listed &amp; the types of development made clear - otherwise this area of the Draft Plan is inadequately detailed to have proper meaning to the general public, who must be kept well informed about the opportunities &amp; the risks of local beach development.</p>				
Stevens	Angela	163		Observation	<p>This policy contradicts itself!</p> <p><b>"New development including new built facilities, the provision of public car parking facilities and new or improved vehicular access to serve such beaches will not be permitted. In the exceptional event that development is permitted..."</b></p>	Either the undeveloped beaches will be protected or not! A decision should be made one way or the other, not have a get out clause, just in case. Too woolly.	678		Web
Twizell	Heather	512	Natural England	Object	<p><b>Thanet's Beaches</b></p> <p>Natural England supports the final caveat in Policies E10 to E12 making it clear that any development on Thanet's beaches will be subject to the Habitats Regulations. However, we would suggest amending the wording slightly to "Development proposals must <i>avoid or</i> fully mitigate against any impact upon the designated nature conservation sites" as this would better reflect the avoid, mitigate compensate hierarchy as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF.</p>		1469		Email

Language Schools E13										
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
Lorenzo	Peter	37	The Broadstairs Society		Support	The Society supports this policy		77		Web
Solly	C	419			Observation	Sustainable transport options should be considered.	Include availability and accessibility of sustainable transport options.	1248		Email

Quex Park E14										
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			Object	Policy E14 - add 'and their settings' after "conserve and enhance the heritage assets".	Policy E14 - add 'and their settings' after "conserve and enhance the heritage assets".	935		Email
Giddins	Rod	62			Support	I also welcome Policy E14 (Quex Park) and its importance not only to the landscape and open space provision in Birchington but also to the local economy.		173		Email
Stevens	Angela	163			Object	The Quex land should NOT be sold for housing.	Make it clearer in the LP what the proposals are on the Quex Park estate.	679		Web