

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Cleve Hill Solar Park](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 2  
**Date:** 21 June 2019 21:51:55

---

Dear Hefin,

- ExQ 1.0.8 - In support of Swale Borough Council's Local Impact Report, as The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains no specific policies for solar power development I do not believe it is appropriate for NPS EN-3 or EN-5 to be used to assess this application. NPS EN-1 does, in part, refer to this type of application. As required by Section 105 of The Planning Act 2008, in the absence of a specific NPS for solar power, the Secretary of State must have regard to SBC's LIR and is not bound to decide the application in accordance with any particular NPS. Additionally, in the absence of a specific and relevant NPS, local planning policy should be referred to when considering this application including Swale Borough Council and Kent County Council planning policies.
- My written representation is as follows:
  - I have many concerns about the Cleve Hill Solar Park proposals but the one that concerns me most in the short term is the impact the construction traffic will have on our village. The road is completely unsuitable for the volume and type of traffic that will travel along it during the two and a half years suggested it will take to complete the construction.

The majority of the road has no footpath and also nowhere for walkers to get out of the way of traffic, with high or steep verges. This is dangerous for anyone who is walking along the road, including children walking to and from school and people walking their dogs. Additionally, as the route is on National Cycling Route 1, there are high volumes of cyclists who will also be at increased risk with the additional volumes of lorries.

As a resident, we already have problems travelling through the village and often have to pull over to allow the local bus, local removal firm and tractors to pass as the road isn't wide enough to accommodate them and a car. This will increase as more lorries use the road during construction, inconveniencing and delaying us from undergoing our normal day-to-day activities.

This road is also the only diversion available when there are problems on the A299 with many instances of traffic being diverted and causing traffic queues and delays. This is without the increased traffic that will be experienced during construction and does not appear to have been adequately considered in the Traffic Management Plan. Where will the construction traffic go during these periods?

In addition to the sheer volume of traffic, I am also concerned about the increased levels of emissions that will be experienced during this period, particularly for Graveney Village School whose playground is alongside the main route. With so much publicity about the risk of diesel particulates on

public health this, in itself, should be sufficient to deny approval of this route. Additionally, the school's sports field is on the opposite side of the road so they will be at increased risk when accessing this, and they have regular visits to All Saints Church which again presents increased risk as they walk to and from the church.

The vast majority of people who live along this route are retired, including myself. This means we will experience increased noise, vibration, emission pollution and traffic 6 days a week, which is completely unacceptable and not something that we will have any opportunity to avoid.

In summary, the proposed route is simply not suitable for this type of construction traffic on any basis. The application should be refused.

Regards,

Tom King