

Alexander Gunyon

From: Helen Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 22:05
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to policy C12

Categories: Blue category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

From Helen Smith

I strongly object to Policy C12 relating to the University of Kent development in the local plan as it has significant negative impacts

The inclusion of this site in the Local Plan comes as a surprise, as previous assessments have found it unsuitable for housing development for a large number of reasons. The most recent Strategic Land Availability Assessment from December 2023 notes there would be: "Significant negative effects on Biodiversity, Geology, Landscape, Water, Historic environment (site contains a Scheduled Ancient Monument and is adjacent to Grade 2* and Grade 2 Listed Buildings, with likely impacts on the heritage assets and/or their setting) and Land use (site is a greenfield over 3ha)."

Impossibly demanding deliverability targets

The latest Strategic Land Availability Assessment goes on to say: "While the SA has identified significant and minor negative impacts, it is determined, when reviewed alongside the SLAA on the balance of impacts and considering possible mitigation and design, that the majority of these impacts can be addressed."

However, the *possible mitigations* are so demanding and unlikely that they cannot be achieved:

- The site is within the Green Gap and would lead to settlement coalescence. Due to the size of the site, character of the area including projection into the open countryside, isolated location separate from the urban area/settlement, and existing views, development would have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding open countryside.
- There are significant heritage sites and conservation areas all around the proposed area for development, protected by national planning laws.
- The site is a greenfield area of more than 100 hectares, and is Grade 3 agricultural land currently used for arable crops and grazing.
- This would be a large-scale car-dependent development (even with additional buses planned). Tyler Hill Road is narrow, and the junction between Tyler Hill Road and Blean Common has had several incidents meaning more traffic could cause significant negative impacts on the highway network.
- The previous Local Plan to 2045 included a Western bypass as a proposed way to expand local road capacity, as the Council recognises that local roads in North Canterbury are already at their limits. The Western bypass has now been removed from the local plan, with no alternative suggestion for how 2,000 additional households with cars could get around the city.
- Loss of such a large, well-used and significant open space cannot be adequately "reprovided" within the site – it is a huge local asset and amenity, which no amount of mitigation or substitution can replace.
- Flood risk is given a positive assessment in the latest SLAA – a big point of concern as we believe the SLAA is wrong. The majority of the site is London Clay (as noted in the [Landscape Character Assessment and Biodiversity Appraisal 2020](#)) so not free-draining and liable to flooding. A huge amount of mitigation would be needed to make the site viable for thousands of houses, paved

gardens and tarmac roads. Planning advisors say it may be virtually impossible to mitigate against surface flooding. Councils across the UK are increasingly facing flash-flooding compensation claims from residents and businesses for poor flood planning.

- The SLAA notes there are still “Uncertainties” regarding biodiversity: “no biodiversity evidence but within an orange area for Great Crested Newts.” There is in fact significant biodiversity evidence, with multiple protected species being sighted, studied and mapped on national data sets such as the [National Biodiversity Network Atlas](#) and [iNaturalist](#).
- There is also a note re Uncertainties around practical timings between the loss and “reprovision” of Blean Primary School. The local communities are deeply concerned that a primary school rated Outstanding by Ofsted could be closed for a long period and/or massively disrupted.

Impact on the whole Canterbury District

The proposed housing development north of the University would swell the current population – around **3,700** across the three villages – to an estimated **10,000**. All the associated pressures on traffic, GPs, hospitals, waste management and water supply would follow.

The Stodmarsh Issue – where Natural England has had to call for a pause to house-building to stop irreversible damage to the Stodmarsh River and National Nature Reserve, caused by nitrates from non-organic farming and human sewage – is also still a major concern and needs to be managed at the District level.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Smith

Alexander Gunyon

From: Helen Smith <helensorted@googlemail.com>
Sent: 02 June 2024 21:56
To: Consultations
Subject: Objection to policies W3 and W4

Categories: Blue category

You don't often get email from helensorted@googlemail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

--Email From External Account--

From Helen Smith
34 Cromwell Road Whitstable Kent CT5 1NW

I wish to inform you that I strongly object to policies W3 and W4 (Brooklands Farm) of the draft Local Plan to 2040

This proposal is in clear contradiction to your own Landscape Character Assessment (as published 2020.) which states planners should resist development in the A299 New Thanet Way corridor.

1400 houses would likely include up to two extra vehicles per unit, ie 2800 more cars using the South Street / Millstrood road route to supermarkets and Whitstable and South Street to Canterbury St. Stephens and on into North Canterbury, both routes are already subject to serious overuse and poor road condition, this proposal can only increase the problem.

The proposed new junction linking the A299 to Chestfield Rd and South Street will feed yet more cars onto the routes mentioned above, pollution will increase as would litter and noise all of which would unacceptably affect the well-being of villagers living in Chestfield, South Street and Tyler Hill.

Swalecliffe Brook regularly floods, your proposal places the development in this area, as well as the likely drainage problems for the proposed properties themselves, more worrying is the accompanying increase in hard standing (drives, roads and predilection for concrete in gardens) which will reduce the ability of the land to absorb run-off during periods of wet weather, particularly during the predicted more frequent periods of excessive rainfall where already saturated land cannot absorb the run-off leading to flash flooding of the Swalecliffe Brook down to the coast, ie not just the proposed properties but many more low lying properties downstream in Chestfield and Swalecliffe will experience more frequent flooding.

This will also increase the frequency that the Southern Water Treatment plant at Swalecliffe will release untreated Sewage into the Swalecliffe Brook. It already regularly releases during times of extreme run-off, the extra treatment demand from 1400 houses will compound the problem.

Whitstable and most of East Kent is already subject to an epidemic of unaffordable house building which does nothing practical to help those that really need housing ie the poor and rental market. This proposal adds nothing new but does increase pollution, noise and will negatively impact local services and utilities.

All development on Green land removes future options for arable use, removes wildlife and reduces biodiversity and makes it ever more difficult for local inhabitants to access the well documented benefits of living near green areas and wildlife. Our green land should be valued and protected not permanently given up to developers for short term gain.

Yours faithfully,
Helen Smith