

Alexander Gunyon

From: PAUL LUKEHURST [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2024 18:54
To: Consultations
Subject: 2040 Canterbury Local Plan Consultation

Categories: Blue category

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

--Email From External Account--

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is: Paul Lukehurst
[REDACTED]

Having read through the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan - Consultation, I broadly support the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan as a whole. Any comments I have to make are listed below.

However, first a few words of praise for Canterbury City Council. Thank you so much for removing the old Policy R1 from the revised 2040 Canterbury Local Plan. Thank you for listening and making that wise decision.

Leaving aside all of the other building developments either currently being built or proposed in and around Aylesham, if Policy R1 (the original Cooting Community Garden New Town development), hadn't been removed from the revised 2040 Canterbury Local Plan, then the proposed 3200 plus dwellings, @ a possible average of 2 adults and one child per household, plus the proposed 320 single older person homes, could easily have translated into around 10,000 extra local residents! Such a huge population explosion in what is mainly a quiet rural location, would have completely overrun both local infrastructure and services. Also, such a huge development would have had the effect of creating a vast urban sprawl in what is currently beautiful rolling highly productive agricultural countryside. In doing so, it would also have destroyed the identity of our ancient village of Adisham which has stood on this site almost since before time.

The reasons for removing the old Policy R1 were as follows:

1. The loss of around 173 hectares of valuable productive farming land, **for ever!**
2. The loss/damage to local flora/fauna (wildlife).
3. Increased light pollution at night.
4. Increased noise pollution.
5. The detrimental effects of a local population explosion on local services and infrastructure.

6. The pressure on local water supplies.
7. The pressure on local sewage treatment.
8. Increased risk of localised flooding.
9. The massive increase in daily vehicle movements.
9. Increased air pollution.
10. Loss of our independent village and community identity.
11. Insufficient local jobs to support such an increased population.

All these factors would also have led to a huge reduction in the quality of life.

These reasons are just as valid now. So, I urge you to reject any attempt to reintroduce this policy, in any form, into the final draft of the 2040 Canterbury Local Plan.

With 4000 houses approved on the Mountfield site and Dover District Council proposing another 1000 plus homes in the South Aylesham/Snowdown area, it must be time to put further plans on hold for the south of Canterbury, at least until these houses are built?

My Comments:

Policy C17: Land at Canterbury Business Park

I oppose Policy C17. I can't understand how or why this Policy C17 has found its way into the draft 2040 Canterbury Local Plan, as it seems to be at odds with the stated **Strategic objectives for the district** (see page 9). One of those strategic objectives is to "Protect and enhance our rich environment and valued landscapes, etc...". Whilst Policy C17, (Page 65, 2(a)), does detail ways that the effects of any further building in this location should be mitigated, surely it would be far better for our "valued landscapes" if no further building were permitted at all in this location? Policy C17 even states that the proposed development is in a prominent position in the surrounding landscape, and mentions the special qualities of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the historic context. As this proposed development would involve building on the precious Kent Downs National Landscape with the associated irreparable damage to both flora and fauna, I must therefore oppose it. It would also involve losing productive farm land and create even more light pollution at night. This site is already a major light polluter. Also, any new development could also add to the vehicle movements on what are already over used local narrow lanes.

Policy R12: Land west of Cooting Lane and South of Station Road

I have the following concerns regarding Policy R12. I am not against new development in Adisham, however, I believe that this location presents potential vehicular access/egress and parking difficulties

which could prove dangerous. Station Road and Downs Road, Adisham, are already very well used routes and can become very busy at certain times of the day. Policy R12 is only a small development of, "approximately 10 new dwellings fronting onto Station Road only. However, Station Road is regularly congested with parked cars which often create a pinch point at that location. Therefore, building a new development with access/egress at this point will only serve to cause further congestion and increased potential for accidents.

I am also concerned that even though this proposed development is for 10 dwellings, the length of the "Opportunities for green corridors" arrow on the Policy R12 site plan, tends to suggest that these ten dwellings are only the first of what is intended to become a much larger development.

Yours sincerely

Paul Lukehurst