

Alexander Gunyon

From: Suzanne Kincaid [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 21:05
To: Consultations
Subject: Local plan consultation comments - C12

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Hello,

My name is Suzanne Kincaid and I live at [REDACTED]
I am writing in regards to policy C12. I have a number of objections to this plan.

1) Ancient woodland

On some of the proposed site for the c2000 houses, there are areas of ANCIENT woodland. A fact that you appear to overlook/downplay. For example, The Brotherhood Wood is ancient woodland. To quote The Blean Research Group 2002 "The Blean: the woodland of a Cathedral City" page 137 - "Several ancient woodland indicator plants were found including yellow archangel, wood spurge, woodrush, wood anemone and bluebell, as well as wood millet". On Magicmap, both Long Thin Wood (also known as Sarre Penn Shaw) and West Triangle wood are categorised as ancient and semi natural, as well as other wood nearby.

The Land Use Consultants (LUC) wrote the 2020 Canterbury Landscape Character Assessment & Biodiversity Appraisal. They mention that the land in question in Policy C12, as well as it's surrounding areas, have high sensitivities and biodiversity that it provides.

The use of Avison Young in the creation of this policy is completely inappropriate. They are wholly inexperienced to deal with the complexities, understanding and research needed to compile a comprehensive report to advise on Policy C12, nor to accurately designate areas of the site correctly in terms of the significance of this location. Point 6.15 states that the woodland at Long Thin Wood "may not meet the definition of ancient woodland" and "the evidence did not find ancient trees within the woodland ". However if the older name for the woodland: Sarre Penn Shaw is researched, as I have mentioned above, it IS in fact Ancient woodland and there does not need to be the presence of ancient trees to be in fact and ancient woodland.

The Kent University's Biodiversity Strategy 2021-2025 mentions that "When surveyed in 2014 West Triangle Wood and Long Thin Wood were assessed as providing a high-quality ecological resource and that no changes to the existing management were recommended." It is absolutely appalling that such a place should be considered by Canterbury City Council and Kent University to be destroyed.

Not only is ancient woodland protected, it absorbs large amounts of CO2, which we can all agree is imperative to preserve as we are in a CLIMATE EMERGENCY. Not only that, but ancient woodlands contain some of our oldest and carbon-rich soils. In ancient woodlands, the relatively undisturbed soils are one of the key reservoirs of biodiversity, having developed over hundreds or thousands of years. The Government website itself states "Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is defined as an irreplaceable habitat. It is a valuable natural asset important for: wildlife (which include rare and threatened species) - there is also standing advice for protected species.

In your (CCC) 2021 Landscape Character Assessment, it describes the "strong rural character" of this area and the need to conserve this important landscape. The proposal goes completely against this and would destroy this historic and irreplaceable habitat and surrounding area.

2) St Cosmos and Damien Blean church

Between 1982-1986, The Blean Historical and Archaeological Group carried out detailed research on the area of the Church as well as its surrounding areas. It found that the area to the south west of the church had a Roman villa in the 1st - 3rd centuries and later in 13th century a fortified villa on the same site. By the time of the Domesday book, there were 12 surrounding farmsteads, and the area had been long established by then.

3) Habitat

The Blean area is a biodiversity hotspot - clear for all to see, but also acknowledged by yourselves. Policy C12 would completely go against this, and the need to not only preserve but also enhance these rural areas.

In addition to the swathes of woodland and fields that would be destroyed through this project, there would be further habitat loss.

Swallows, nightingales, skylarks all call the Crab and Winkle way and fields surrounding (where the proposal are located) their home.

Section c of Policy C12 states "Assess the site's potential to be functionally linked land for Golden Plover". The Golden Plover's habitat in the winter is on "agricultural land" (of which some of the proposed site is).

Hedgerows would be lost, which are an incredibly critical and PROTECTED habitat. The Woodland Trust states "Vital features in the landscape, hedges are more than an essential refuge for wildlife. Small but mighty, they also clean our air, capture carbon, reduce flooding and give clues to historic land management. Hedges have been planted for thousands of years and centuries' old examples can still be seen." As well as being corridors to travel for wildlife.

The Blean woods area (comprising of a number of woods in the area, and the surrounding countryside) is a precious area. My family and friends frequently visit these areas, cycling, scooting, walking for the tranquility and fresh air away from the city that this provides.

As you have noted yourselves, the Blean woodland areas need to have greater connectivity. By placing a HUGE housing estate in the middle of this would completely go against this and connectivity would be impossible.

C12 goes against DS19 - building this urban sprawl & in this location would join the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill, with no real separation of them any longer.

4) The Crab and Winkle Way

This well known route is a huge asset to the area, not only on terms of its history, but also the physical and mental wellbeing that it provides to residents and visitors alike. It provides people with a sanctuary away from the city, fresh air, seeing wildlife, hearing birdsong. It cannot be underestimated how important this place is to residents. The proposed plan shows as either side of the Crab and Winkle way, with everything destroyed. A complete travesty.

5) Transport

In line with Canterbury City Council having declared a Climate Emergency (as well it should), it is extremely important to acknowledge AND use action to address this environmental disaster.

The proposal of this huge housing estate will increase traffic and congestion immensely. 2000-4000 new cars will fill our roads. It is inevitable that should this go ahead, Canterbury City Council will be complicit in contributing to climate change and the implications that we will all face as a result.

The council should be focusing its efforts on homes close to the city where foot and bicycle would be the preferred method of travel. Whereas with this plan, vehicular use would be the primary transport option.

The adopted Local Plan 2017 (policy EMP7) requires that proposals for significant development at Kent University must be subject to updating of the University's Transport Impact Assessment and a review of the University Travel Plan. However, neither of these has been produced in relation to site C12.

A bus first strategy that you would like to implement is very unlikely to succeed. Many individuals and families do not use public transport because of the unreliability of the buses, the logistics of utilising the buses, the need to do

quick journeys (eg school run, local shops) as well as the need to transport things around easily (eg supermarket shopping, DIY etc). The distance to town means that people are extremely unlikely to revert to utilising buses first.

6) Pollution & Blean Primary School

My daughter attends Blean primary school. I am extremely concerned that this Outstanding school will be knocked down, and another far far larger school will be built nearby in it's place. What a terrible terrible idea.

Pollution from the building works would continue for years whilst the site is constructed. The toxic fumes from the continuous construction traffic, combined with the toxic dust caused and the particulates from exhaust fumes will be highly detrimental to the health of all children at the school, let alone residents living nearby.

Air pollution is a factor in at least 30,000 deaths each year in the UK. The World Health Organisation states that "particulate pollution overall is associated with negative impacts on cardiovascular and respiratory health".

In a 2017 study by Ankita Salvi et al, they found that "prolonged exposure to pro-oxidants in vehicle exhaust increased anxiety-and depression-like behavior as well as led to impaired memory.... This is important preclinical evidence, particularly relevant to human population exposed to high vehicular traffic."

The children at Blean primary school would be exposed to this construction traffic over a prolonged period whilst construction took place, very close to the school premises and playgrounds.

Blean Primary school is a wonderful school, and is the only Outstanding school in the area. How would you accommodate for the existing pupils along with the approx 4000 children that would be needing school places as a result of this development? Blean school would lose it's Ofsted rating and the community that exists would be gone. It is difficult to over emphasise this impact that knocking down the school would have on the pupils and teaching staff.

7) Kent Community Oasis garden

This idyllic place would be destroyed by the housing development. It is such an important place to the local community, and improves quality of life and mental health immensely.

Please remember your duty. Restore nature, do not destroy it and everything that residents and visitors love about this precious, important, historically significant area.

8) Farmland

By building on this site, you would be eradicating swathes of farmland. We need to become a more sustainable country and reduce food miles. Development here would completely go against this necessity. The farmland concerned is Grade 2 and Grade 3 land, and therefore is amongst some of the best in the UK. As a country, we currently do not produce enough of our own food, and the irradiation of this precious fertile land would be irreversible.

Part of your Local Plan is protecting fertile farmland, however this development would completely go against that.

Please consider these points and evidence when reviewing your Local Plan.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards, Suzanne

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)