

Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040

Chapter 5: Rural areas

Policy	Number of written comments
Policy R1: Rural Service Centres	91
Policy R2: Great Pett Farmyard	26
Policy R3: Land at Ashford Road (east)	22
Policy R4: Land at Ashford Road (west)	22
Policy R5: Bread and Cheese Field	78
Policy R6: Land at Hersden	29
Policy R7: The Hill, Littlebourne	166
Policy R8: Land north of Court Hill	114
Policy R9: Land north of Popes Lane	40
Policy R10: Land at The Paddocks, Shalloak Road	34
Policy R11: Local Service Centres	34
Policy R12: Land west of Cooting Lane and south of Station Road	84
Policy R13: Land adjacent to Valley Road	24
Policy R14: Land at Goose Farm, Shalloak Road	29
Policy R15: Land at Shalloak Road	25
Policy R16: Land fronting Mayton Lane	28
Policy R17: Broad Oak Reservoir and Country Park	64
Policy R18: Land at Church Farm	29
Policy R19: Countryside	72
Any other comments	46
Total comments	1,056

Policy R1 - Rural Service Centres

- Existing amenities and services inadequate to support any further development: 26 comments
- Support for the changed scale proposed for development: 23 comments
- Development will destroy much prime agricultural land and traditional open space: 21 comments
- Level of growth disproportionate to rural living (too much development): 19 comments
- Development threatens the character of existing communities: 18 comments
- Existing road infrastructure inadequate to support further development (congestion concerns): 16 comments
- Concerns over impact on ancient woodland and natural environment/wildlife: 14 comments
- Local plan policies conflict with other policies: 7 comments
- Public transport needs to be improved in terms of frequency: 5 comments
- Policy missing details/unclear: 4 comments
- Policy needs to incorporate locally created policy: 3 comments
- Concern sites have been missed in the allocation/ appraised incorrectly: 3 comments
- External pressures (students, temporary housing) impacting residents: 3 comments
- Improvements to walking/cycling routes are required: 3 comments
- Recommendation to include wording in local plan: 2 comments
- Positive impact of public transport links and improvements: 1 comment
- Concern developers will not be help to account: 1 comment

Policy R2 - Great Pett Farmyard

- Oppose building on farmland and destroying natural environment/wildlife: 5 comments
- In favour of proposed development: 4 comments
- Wording of policy should be amended to be more reflective of existing site context: 3 comments
- Development is proportionate: 3 comments
- Infrastructure improvements needed: 3 comments
- Questions need to be answered regarding existing site applications: 2 comments
- Public transport and active travel paths require improvement: 2 comments
- Too many homes being used as student accommodation/HMO stock: 1 comment
- Further engagement with stakeholders required: 1 comment
- Request for policy wording to be changed/amended: 1 comment

Policy R3 - Land at Ashford Road (east)

- Request to update wording to include stakeholder suggestions: 3 comments
- Development should not proceed on this site: 3 comments
- Pollution concerns (light, air, noise): 2 comments
- Agree with the policy: 2 comments
- Current infrastructure is inadequate: 2 comments
- More details of economic opportunity would be welcomed/supported: 1 comment
- Access to cycle routes and cycle improvements needed: 1 comment
- Concern for increase in traffic: 1 comment
- More affordable housing required: 1 comment

Policy R4 - Land at Ashford Road (west)

- No more new houses: 5 comments
- Proposal of policy inclusion from stakeholders: 3 comments
- Concern regarding traffic increase: 3 comments
- Protect landscape/farmland: 2 comments
- Concern over impact to infrastructure: 2 comments
- Concern over lack of improvements/protection for cyclists: 1 comment
- Concern regarding increase in pollution: 1 comment
- Affordable homes required: 1 comment

Policy R5 - Bread and Cheese Field

- Sturry link road/A28 cannot cope with the level of development in this area of the district: 40 comments
- Not enough existing infrastructure to support more development: 37 comments
- Protect the countryside / agricultural land / landscape: 35 comments
- Should be provisions for a “green gap” to retain unique nature of the villages: 30 comments
- Should protect historic and cultural character: 22 comments
- Already significant development occurring in Hersden so resist further greenfield development: 15 comments
- Current Boundary drawings are incorrect and do not account for existing properties: 14 comments
- Concern regarding data used to inform policy decisions: 10 comments
- Protection needed for wildlife: 8 comments
- Careful consideration required for planning at this site due to existing restrictions: 3 comments
- Request to update/amend policy wording: 3 comments
- No more new houses: 2 comments
- Should remove the requirement for the relief road: 2 comments
- Ongoing Community Governance Review needs conclude prior to decisions made for the site: 2 comments
- Approval of policy proposals: 2 comments
- Protection/improvements needed for cycling routes: 1 comment

Policy R6 - Land at Hersden

- Policy wording should be changed to include recommendations from stakeholders: 6 comments
- No more new houses: 5 comments
- Conserve biodiversity and wildlife: 4 comments
- Support for smaller scale developments that build needed houses: 4 comments
- Local area cannot cope with increase in traffic: 3 comments
- Support for brownfield regeneration: 2 comments
- Infrastructure in the area will not cope with increase in residents: 2 comments
- Further protection/improvements required for cycling routes: 1 comment
- Policy to protect environment are welcome: 1 comment
- Development will be visible from Hoath, contrary to landscape appraisal which states views in H2 and H3 landscape zones must be preserved: 1 comment

Policy R7 - The Hill, Littlebourne

- Existing local road infrastructure is not suitable to accommodate additional traffic pressures: 116 comments
- Significant sewage and / or water supply concerns: 112 comments
- Development will result in loss of prime agricultural land / green spaces: 79 comments
- Local infrastructure cannot support more development: 76 comments
- Development generates significant flooding concerns: 72 comments
- The school and GP surgery will not be able to cope with the additional population increase: 62 comments
- Concern about impact on ecology and wildlife: 50 comments
- Development will destroy character of Littlebourne: 40 comments
- Development disproportionate to the size of Littlebourne: 33 comments
- Concerns around lack of buses, cycling and walking routes for the modal shift: 31 comments
- Concerns over impact on heritage and history: 27 comments
- Concern over pollution: 23 comments
- Policy wording needs to be changed: 7 comments
- Concern over lack of sustainable development: 7 comments
- Build on brownfield sites instead: 6 comments
- Local people do not want this: 4 comments
- Homes will not be affordable for local people: 3 comments
- Development will cause serious impact on the local area: 3 comments
- Concern over impact that development causes to the local area: 3 comments
- Concerns around poor internet connection in the area: 3 comments
- Application for 115 houses at R15 has already been refused by CCC (CA/21/01657): 2 comments
- In favour of development to supply homes to young families: 2 comments
- Concern regarding consultation process: 2 comments
- Additional nursery or school needed: 1 comment

Policy R8 - Land north of Court Hill

- Existing local road infrastructure is not suitable to accommodate additional traffic pressures: 78 comments
- Significant sewage concerns associated with development: 69 comments
- Development will result in loss of prime agricultural land: 58 comments
- Basic infrastructure inadequate to support further development: 51 comments
- Development generates significant flooding concerns: 37 comments
- The school and GP surgery will not be able to cope with the additional population increase: 35 comments
- Concern regarding pollution: 28 comments
- Development generates significant water supply concerns: 27 comments
- Concern over wildlife and ecology: 26 comments
- Concern over impact to heritage sites: 22 comments
- Development disproportionate to the size of Littlebourne: 17 comments
- Concern for lack of sustainable development policies: 15 comments
- Littlebourne has already seen enough development recently: 14 comments
- Walking/cycling is not safe with the current roads: 10 comments
- Land is very difficult to access by vehicle-only one vehicle can make it up/down access road at a time due to parking: 7 comments
- Terminology needs to be changed in the policy: 4 comments
- Do not believe the affordable housing will be delivered: 4 comments
- Concern over impact development will have on the local area: 3 comments
- Local people do not want this: 3 comments
- Concern over an increase in crime: 2 comments
- Support proposal for mixed use development: 2 comments
- Concern over consultation process: 1 comment
- Brownfield development should be the primary focus and not rural: 1 comment

Policy R9 - Land north of Popes Lane

- Inadequate road infrastructure to support further development-will contribute to significant rise in congestion: 18 comments
- Insufficient infrastructure in the area: 10 comments
- The development will result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land: 8 comments
- Impact on wildlife and biodiversity would be detrimental: 8 comments
- There is not enough support given to protect the rural character of these areas: 7 comments
- Policy terminology needs to be amended: 6 comments
- Site previously refused planning permission: 5 comments
- No more new houses: 5 comments
- Lack of open spaces available for recreation: 5 comments
- Pollution concerns: 3 comments
- Insufficient cycling/walking infrastructure to support development: 3 comments
- More affordable homes needed in the area: 2 comments
- Area has already undergone enough development-no more: 2 comments
- Lack of available bus services: 1 comment

Policy R10 - Land at The Paddocks, Shalloak Road

- Development would be detrimental to biodiversity and wildlife: 10 comments
- Area cannot cope with an increase to traffic: 6 comments
- Policy terminology needs to be amended: 6 comments
- No new homes needed in the area: 4 comments
- Local infrastructure cannot cope with increase in residents: 3 comments
- In favour of development of affordable homes for young families: 2 comments
- A logical extension in a sustainable location: 2 comments
- Issues with a third part over land access: 2 comments
- Ensure no access to Shalloak Road: 1 comment
- Lack of open recreational space will affect residents: 1 comment
- Build on brownfield sites: 1 comment

Policy R11 - Local Service Centres

- Development should be minor infill and not impact on existing character: 9 comments
- Local infrastructure is not sufficient to cope with increase in residents: 8 comments
- Public transport is not sufficient and needs improvement: 6 comments
- Concern with impact on greenspaces, agricultural land: 6 comments
- Concern over increase of traffic in the area: 6 comments
- Request to amend policies and terminology used in the plan: 5 comments
- Support for policy: 4 comments
- Wickhambreaux was defined in 2011 as a village which is unsustainable due to lack of facilities. We have now been rated a local service centre despite having no more or less facilities than in 2010: 3 comments
- Local plan conflicts with existing policies: 2 comments
- Adisham is a village and should not become a local service centre as it does not have the facilities: 2 comments
- Hoath should not be designated a rural service centre - although it meets minimum criteria it seems completely inappropriate: 2 comments
- Entire policy should be withdrawn: 2 comments
- Application for development in Lower Hadres incorrectly missed from the Local Plan: 1 comment
- Concern with impact to wildlife: 1 comment

Policy R12 - Land west of Cooting Lane and south of Station Road

- Road infrastructure is unsuitable for more traffic: 41 comments
- Development will degrade natural wildlife habitats: 23 comments
- Need more parking spaces: 22 comments
- In favour of development to supply homes to young local families: 19 comments
- Significant sewage concerns: 15 comments
- Policy requires further review for boundary and terminology used: 10 comments
- Significant noise, light and air pollution concerns: 10 comments
- Surface runoff and flooding concern: 9 comments
- Protect agricultural land/countryside: 8 comments
- Suitable foot/cycling paths need to be installed: 6 comments
- Support for revised policies: 6 comments
- This policy will detrimentally impact the character of the existing village: 6 comments
- Homes are not affordable for young people: 5 comments
- Brownfield regeneration should come before greenfield sites: 4 comments
- No more new houses: 4 comments
- Local infrastructure is not suitable for an increase in residents: 3 comments
- Significant water supply concerns: 3 comments
- Permission to develop the land has been withdrawn: 1 comment
- Improved public transport required: 1 comment
- Stakeholders request for further engagement with developers to ensure standards are met: 1 comment

Policy R13 - Land adjacent to Valley Road

- No further development needed in this area: 4 comments
- Road infrastructure inadequate to support further development: 3 comments
- Policy terminology needs to be amended: 3 comments
- Support for development in the area: 3 comments
- Green spaces/agricultural land needs to be protected: 2 comments
- Development will not benefit local community as there is no affordable element incorporated: 2 comments
- Essential to retain the existing mature trees along western boundary of proposed site: 1 comment
- Improvements needed for cycling infrastructure: 1 comment
- More affordable housing is required: 1 comment
- Brownfield regeneration needs to be prioritised: 1 comment

Policy R14 - Land at Goose Farm, Shalloak Road

- Extra houses and businesses will contribute to more traffic pressures: 6 comments
- Policy details need further clarification/terminology amending: 6 comments
- No more new houses: 3 comments
- Should not build on agricultural land as we need it to soak up rainwater to prevent flooding: 3 comments
- Concern over development extending into countryside: 2 comments
- Improvements needed for cycling/walking paths: 2 comments
- Further public transport improvements required: 2 comments
- Concern regarding impact to infrastructure: 2 comments
- More affordable housing needed: 2 comments
- Opportunity to expand this site and deliver more homes and employment should be taken: 1 comment
- Protection needed for heritage assets: 1 comment
- Policy details conflicting: 1 comment
- Brownfield regeneration should be a priority: 1 comment

Policy R15 - Land at Shalloak Road

- Insufficient road infrastructure or congestion concerns: 5 comments
- Too many houses: 5 comments
- Public services concerns: 4 comments
- Insufficient sewage and water infrastructure: 4 comments
- Pollution concerns: 3 comments
- Damages farmland: 3 comments
- Damages nature: 2 comments
- Damages rural character and identity: 2 comments
- More affordable homes: 2 comments
- Improve active travel and public transport: 2 comments
- Supports brownfield development: 1 comment
- Add easement for Southern Water: 1 comment
- Protect footpaths: 1 comment
- Insufficient community and recreational facilities: 1 comment
- Damages rural character: 1 comment

Policy R16 - Land fronting Mayton Lane

- Too many houses: 6 comments
- Improve roads or congestion concerns: 4 comments
- Damages rural character and identity: 3 comments

- More community or recreational areas needed: 2 comments
- Improve drainage infrastructure: 2 comments
- Develop on brownfield sites or protect greenfield: 2 comments
- Build affordable homes: 2 comments
- Protect farmland: 2 comments
- More public services needed: 2 comments
- Reduce number of allocations: 1 comment
- Improve active travel and public transport: 1 comment
- Landowner viability concerns: 1 comment
- Retain this allocation: 1 comment
- Sewage infrastructure concerns: 1 comment

Policy R17 - Broad Oak Reservoir and Country Park

- Planning for fresh water supply is essential: 18 comments
- Supports the nature or recreational provisions: 18 comments
- Enforcement and deliverability concerns: 11 comments
- Filling the reservoir may damage Stodmarsh or Stour: 9 comments

- This is a highly sensitive location and the policy wording to protect irreplaceable and priority habitats should be as strong as possible: 7 comments
- Protect Sarre Penn: 7 comments
- Causes large loss of farmland: 5 comments
- Is it needed?: 4 comments
- Further engagement planning work required before construction due to traffic constraints: 3 comments
- Access by people will disturb wildlife: 2 comments
- Needs to be delivered before other housing developments are constructed to ensure supply is maintained: 1 comment
- Amenity concerns if reservoir empty in the summer: 1 comment
- Reservoir is insufficient if network leakage continues: 1 comment
- Rehouse displaced residents nearby: 1 comment
- Minimise impact on heritage assets: 1 comment
- Don't exceed legal requirements and threaten project viability: 1 comment
- Improve drainage infrastructure: 1 comment

Policy R18 - Land at Church Farm

- Road infrastructure is insufficient or road safety or congestion concerns: 7 comments
- The village is not a sustainable place for development: 6 comments
- Protect farmland: 4 comments
- Protect rural character and identity: 4 comments
- Public transport and active travel are insufficient making development car dependent: 3 comments

- Insufficient community facilities proposed: 2 comments
- Support for the policy: 2 comments
- No more houses: 2 comments
- Supports affordable housing: 2 comments
- Policy needs further stakeholder engagement and terminology needs amendments: 2 comments
- Protect nature: 2 comments
- 20% Biodiversity Net Gain is too high: 1 comment
- Improve public services: 1 comment
- Air pollution concerns: 1 comment
- Improve sewage / water infrastructure: 1 comment

Policy R19 - Countryside

- Protect rural identity and character: 26 comments
- Limit or halt development on countryside: 23 comments
- Protect nature or woodland: 21 comments
- Protect farmland: 20 comments
- Rural roads don't have capacity or improve roads: 12 comments
- Supports recreational exercise facilities or footpaths: 9 comments
- Improve general infrastructure: 7 comments
- Air, noise or light pollution: 5 comments
- Against C12 or C12 is contradictory: 5 comments
- Improve public services: 4 comments
- Supports removing old R1 policy: 4 comments
- Improve sewage or water infrastructure: 4 comments
- Improve public transport or active travel: 4 comments
- Support change or use to residential and economic diversification in rural areas: 4 comments
- Supports affordable housing: 3 comments
- Build more houses or consider our site: 3 comments
- Feasibility, deliverability or funding concerns: 3 comments
- Supports renewable energy on brownfield sites: 2 comments
- Changed of boundaries inconsistent with local planning policies: 1 comment
- Climate change concerns: 1 comment
- Listen to rural residents or communities: 1 comment

Any other comments

- Protect rural character: 12 comments
- Protect nature (Old Park, Chequer's Wood, Stodmarsh): 12 comments
- Improve congestion, roads or road safety: 7 comments
- Protect farmland: 7 comments
- Improve sewage, water infrastructure or water pollution concerns: 7 comments
- Improve public services: 7 comments
- Supports active travel, exercise or rural recreational activities: 6 comments
- Too many houses or against sprawl: 5 comments
- Supports removing old R1 site: 5 comments
- Sustainability or climate change concerns: 4 comments
- Supports public transport: 3 comments
- Protect heritage assets: 3 comments
- Air, noise or light pollution: 2 comments
- Development should be assessed and complete on actual need instead of strategy: 1 comment
- Documents are inaccessible or too long: 1 comment
- Supports affordable housing: 1 comment
- Listen to rural residents: 1 comment
- Against Brooklands Farm policy: 1 comment
- Development is unfairly distributed: 1 comment
- Consider our site: 1 comment
- Improve management and accountability of development: 1 comment
- Reinstate previous agricultural and rural policies: 1 comment